

Amph
Relig. H
B.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA



3 1761 07968292 8

JANUS IN ROMAN LIFE AND CULT

A STUDY IN ROMAN RELIGIONS

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

BESSIE REBECCA BURCHETT

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN
1918



UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

JANUS IN ROMAN LIFE AND CULT

A STUDY IN ROMAN RELIGIONS

A THESIS

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL IN
PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

BESSIE REBECCA BURCHETT

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN
1918



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2010 with funding from
University of Ottawa

The writer wishes to express her sincere thanks to Professor John C. Rolfe, Professor Walton Brooks McDaniel, Professor Roland G. Kent, Assistant Professor George D. Hadzsits and to Dr. E. H. Heffner for their kindly criticism and advice given during the preparation of this thesis.

INTRODUCTION

In the bibliography appended to this thesis are presented some of the works consulted. A complete list of the books dealing with the subject would be far too large to include in so short a work. In the footnotes are given all the references in Latin literature to Janus and to his cult, so far as it lay in the power of the author to compile them. But very few references to secondary sources are given. To have set forth and tried to uphold or to refute the theories of others would have been a long and tedious task, and would merely have obscured the conclusions which the writer wished to deduce from the original material. Occasionally such references are made for the sake of clearness, and in those cases mention is made of the works which best suited the purpose.

The writer is especially indebted to the works of Mr. Grant Allen, Professor Carter, Professor W. W. Fowler, Professor Frazer, and Professor Wissowa.

The conclusions reached are, for the most part, the writer's own, and differ in some respects from the usually accepted ones. However, in the chapters on the "Janus Geminus," on the "Relation of Janus to Other Deities" and on "Miscellanies," will be found little that is new. These chapters are inserted merely for the purpose of giving a complete view of the Janus cult. The theory that the *rex sacrorum* was a human Jupiter has been advanced by Mr. Grant Allen, Dr. A. B. Cook, Professor Frazer and others. It remained only to add to their arguments, which are mostly anthropological, the evidence of Roman literature, and to carry the theory to the conclusion that, if a human Jupiter, the *rex sacrorum* was a priest of Jupiter, not of Janus, as has been hitherto maintained. Furthermore, original passages have been given as evidence that this belief accords with the character and ritual of both the *rex sacrorum* and of the god Janus. Evidence, besides, has been presented to show that Jupiter and Janus are not identical, as some have thought possible, but that they are quite different deities.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION.....	v
CHAPTER I. THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION.....	1
The Beginnings of the Janus-Cult.	
Deification of the dead; Deification of kings; <i>Numina</i> ; Janus a <i>numen</i> of the door-way; Developed into a god of war and of generation.	
CHAPTER II. PRAYERS AND FORMULAS.....	6
Salian hymn; Cato's rustic ritual; Self-devotion; Devoting a city of the enemy; Song of the Arvals; Conclusion.	
CHAPTER III. THE PLACE OF JANUS AS GOD OF BEGINNINGS.....	11
Importance of a good beginning; Examples of beginnings for which Janus was not invoked; The first month of the year originally not sacred to Janus; First day of the year; The Kalends; Dawn; Interpretation of some passages on which has been based the theory that Janus was a god of beginnings; Theories advanced by the Romans explaining the position of Janus at the head of the list of gods; Explaining the place of January at the beginning of the year; Summary.	
CHAPTER IV. STATUES OF JANUS.....	27
No statues of deities among the Romans until late; The statue brought from Egypt by Augustus; The statue from Falerii and the Numa statue; Janus was not an anthropomorphic god, but an arch.	
CHAPTER V. THE CONNECTION OF JANUS WITH EARLY COINAGE.....	30
Theory that the head of Janus on the <i>as</i> originated in the conception of Janus as a door-god, because of the analogy between an entrance and a harbor; More probable that it was the result of an identification of Janus with the Greek Hermes; Portunus, Tiberinus, Voltumnus.	
CHAPTER VI. JANUS GEMINUS AND OTHER JANUS-ARCHES AND TEMPLES.....	37
<i>Janus-Geminus</i> , the true representation of Janus; Origin; Dates of the closing of the gates; Site and appearance; Ceremonies in connection with; the <i>augurium salutis</i> ; <i>Ianus</i> , <i>Summus</i> , <i>Imus</i> , and <i>Medius</i> ; Other <i>Iani</i> ; Temple of C. Duilius.	
CHAPTER VII. THE REX SACRORUM.....	45
Parallelism between the worship of the primitive household and that of the state, discrepancies therein; Incarnate kings, evidences that these existed among the early Romans; Evidence that Jupiter was the god incarnated in the Roman priest-king; The <i>rex sacrorum</i> a priest of Jupiter; Traditions about the establishment of the body of priests adduced as proof of this theory; The <i>agonalia</i> ; Other gods than Janus, who lacked priests; Duties and privileges of the <i>rex sacrorum</i> .	
CHAPTER VIII. RELATION OF JANUS TO OTHER DEITIES.....	63
1. Jupiter; 2. Saturn; 3. Juno; 4. Diana; 5. Mater Matuta; 6. Ops Consiva; 7. Carna.	
CHAPTER IX. MISCELLANIES.....	70
1. Inscriptions; 2. <i>Spolia Opima</i> ; 3. <i>Circenses</i> of January Seventh.	
CONCLUSION	72
Summary of the development of the characteristics and the cult of Janus.	
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	73

CHAPTER I

THEORIES CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF RELIGION

The Beginnings of the Janus-Cult

The study of anthropology and, more especially, of comparative religion has in recent years brought to light some concepts of gods so unlike those entertained by civilized peoples that it requires no little effort to adjust the mind and imagination to their reception. Various theories have been put forth to account for man's first conception of divinity. One of these theories Mr. Grant Allen illustrates by an anecdote told in his *Evolution of the Idea of God*.¹ Sir Richard Burton, he says, was exploring a remote Mohammedan region and, in order to have greater freedom, disguised himself as a fakir of Islam. So successful was he in playing the part of holy man, that he inspired in the people a great reverence for his sanctity. But one night a chief of the village came to him secretly and urged him to flee, if he valued his life. The explorer was much surprised at the possibility of danger, in view of the influence which he had gained among the superstitious natives. But it was this very religious awe, which, as the friendly chief said, was the source of peril; for the people were planning to slay their spiritual master for the laudable purpose of retaining his tomb among them as a shrine. The warning gave this traveler barely time to escape an undesirable apotheosis. Whether or not this story is true (and Mr. Allen refuses to vouch for it), it furnishes a good illustration of the process of manufacturing gods. According to Mr. Allen's theory, the first deities developed from dead men, of whom some died naturally,² and some were slain for the purpose of deifying them. Of course the manufacturing of divinity by human sacrifice was the invention of a later civilization than was the simple worship of men who had died in the ordinary course of nature. Because the people expected to receive benefits from the deified members of their tribe, the thought at some time entered their minds that it might be advantageous to dispatch occasionally to the powerful company of spirits a special representative from among the living; for, on account of his recent experience of their

¹ Allen *Evolution of the Idea of God* p. 271.

² Cf. Cic. *N. D.* 1, 42, 119; Cyprian. *Idol. Van.* 1.

need, they expected him to make a greater effort on their behalf. The good-will of the intended victim they could easily gain beforehand by bestowing on him plentiful gifts and honors. Cases are actually known of persons thus indulged departing life willingly when their time was up. This custom merely hastened the deification of those who were potentially gods. This is a brief view of Mr. Allen's theory about the way in which gods were made.

Professor Frazer gives interesting evidence of the origin of a second sort of divinity. He has taken as the starting point of his two great works, *The Golden Bough* and *Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship*, the strange cult in the grove at Nemi, near Aricia. He begins: "In the sacred grove there grew a certain tree round which . . . a grim figure might be seen to prowl. In his hand he carried a drawn sword, and he kept peering warily about him as if at every instant he expected to be set upon by an enemy. He was a priest and a murderer; and the man for whom he looked was sooner or later to murder him and hold the priesthood in his stead. Such was the rule of the sanctuary. A candidate . . . could succeed to office only by slaying the priest. . . . The post which he held by this precarious tenure carried with it the title of king."³ After collecting a great mass of evidence for the existence of customs similar to this among many different tribes and nations both of the past and of the present, Professor Frazer comes to the conclusion that gods developed from kings. These kings were originally magicians whose most important duty was that of controlling the weather by sympathetic magic. The magical power which they professed to exercise, often making the claim with perfect sincerity, gradually raised them in the eyes of their subjects to the rank of gods. They were propitiated with gifts, they were surrounded with taboos and other safeguards to their divinity. For, if they were well, the land would be fruitful; if they were injured, vegetation would fail, and the flocks would cease to multiply. It was in accordance with this line of reasoning that the people conceived the strange idea of slaying their king-gods while they were still in the prime of life, so that their successors might inherit the divine essence unimpaired by old age or disease. In some nations their rulers seem to have been slain at stated intervals; in others, whenever circumstances might seem to require it. It is easily

³ Frazer *Golden Bough* 1, pp. 8 sqq.; Cf. *Lect. on Kingship*, Chapt. 1.

seen that the two theories, those of Mr. Allen and of Professor Frazer, overlap to some extent, since in both cases the slain victim was already, or potentially, a deity.

Another theory of the development of the religious sense, one better known to students of Roman religion, is that which is lucidly and conveniently given by Professor Carter in his *Religion of Numa*.⁴ He supposes that in very remote antiquity, before the settlement of the Palatine, the primitive Latins conceived of all the objects about them as animated by vague spirits or *numina*. These were not personifications, they were on the contrary, so intangible as to lack name or sex. Some of them, however, did gain name and personality, partly under Greek influence, and so attained the rank of deities.

Several factors, therefore, were probably at work in the creation of the Roman gods. Whether the three sorts came into existence at the same time or at different times, and whether side by side, or in different localities, is hard, perhaps impossible, to determine. Each is, at any rate, a very old notion. Among divinities of the first sort are the Manes who came from deified ancestors. An example of a god developing from an incarnate king is probably Jupiter.⁵ And, in the third place, Janus seems to have joined the heavenly hierarchy after having been the spirit indwelling in a material thing, the door-way.

Among all the various theories, both ancient and modern, of the origin of the two-faced god, this seems to be the one most favored. Evidence for its truth will be given throughout this paper, but, as a preliminary, some facts may be cited here. Although, under the influence of Greek philosophy, Janus became a great cosmic deity, rivalling Jupiter himself as a world-god, nevertheless he is constantly given the functions of a door, or of a door-keeper.⁶ He is represented as carrying a key,⁷ and in mythology he is associated with deities so obscure as Cardea, the spirit of the door-hinge, and Limentinus, of the threshold.⁸ It seems hardly probable that this would have been so, if there had not been some fundamental connection between the god and the door. Indeed,

⁴ Carter *Relig. of Numa* pp. 5 sqq.

⁵ See *J.* Chapt. VII. *J* always refers to this thesis.

⁶ *Lyd. Mens.* 4, 1; *Macrob.* 1, 9, 2; 1, 9, 9; *Ov. F.* 1, 117-125; 1, 138-140; *Septim. Seren. frg.* 1, 1.

⁷ *Arnob.* 6, 25; *Lyd. Mens.* 4, 1; *Ov. F.* 1, 99; 1, 228; 1, 254.

⁸ *Tert. Idol.* 15; *Cor. Mil.* 13.

some of the noblest attributes assigned to him by poets and philosophers associate him with entrances.⁹

Now, although all things were conceived of as animated by vague spirits, or *numina*, only the *numina*, of the more important objects gained any prominence. Among these were the door-way and the hearth. The door-way was a strategic point, since it was the place at which attacks from foes were most to be expected. The hearth also required constant care in primitive times, when fire was difficult to obtain. The *numina* of these objects, therefore, became more holy than others, and assumed, in time, some of the characteristics of their chief votaries. Thus, the fire which was kept by the daughters of the house, became a female deity, Vesta; and the door-way, because its protector was a man, became a god, Janus. It is not to be supposed that all deities, even among the Romans, gained their sex and character in this way; but in these two cases, where the divinities were originally so evidently without personality and where there seems to have been no other reason for assigning sex, this must have been, at least, a determining factor. A passage in St. Augustine is a good illustration of the feeling that male *numina* presided over things pertaining to men, and female over those pertaining to women: *Sed cum et mares et feminae habeant pecuniam, cur non et Pecunia et Pecunius appellatus sit, sicut Rumina et Ruminus, ipsi viderint.*¹⁰

Janus, then, because his chief worshiper was a man, became a male deity. In assuming still further the characteristics of his principal votary, he became a god of generation. As such he had the cognomen *pater*,¹¹ which was assigned to all the gods who were concerned with childbirth. In much the same way he became also a god of war. For, as time went on, when the early Romans felt the need of divine aid for some new activity of life, they did not invent a new deity, but turned

⁹ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 3; 7, 7; Isid. *Etymol.* 8, 11, 37; Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1; 4, 2; Macrobi. 1, 9, 9; 1, 9, 11; Nemes. *Cyneg.* 104-105; Ov. *F.* 1, 125; 1, 139; Septim. Seren. frg. 1, 1.

¹⁰ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 11.

¹¹ Athen. 15, 46; Cato *R. R.* 134; *CIL.* I, p. 334; 382; III, 2881; 3030; 3158; VIII, 2608; 4576; VIII, 11797; XI, 5374; Gell. 5, 12, 3-5; Hor. *Epist.* 1, 16, 59; Lucil. (Marx) 20-22; Macrobi. 1, 9, 15-16; Mart. 8, 2, 8; 10, 28, 7; Plin. *N. H.* 36, 5, 4, 28; Senec. *Apoc.* 9; Serv. *Aen.* 8, 357; Septim. Seren. frg. 1, 1; Verg. *Aen.* 8, 357; Aurel. Vict. *Orig.* 3, 7. For a different theory, see Tert. *Nat.* 2, 11 and Fowler *Relig. Exp.* pp. 155 sqq.

to one or more of the gods whom they already possessed. This is probably one reason why even the early deities overlap in their functions to so great an extent. When the primitive Roman went to war, he invoked, besides the *numina* that he was accustomed to worship, the things connected with this activity: the fields and woods through which he had to pass, and the weapons which he had to use. The spears and shields which were preserved in the Regia were perhaps relics of this ancient worship of weapons.¹² But of all these war deities, Mars gained the ascendancy, and became so important in this later capacity that his original character was almost forgotten; Janus, on the other hand, ceased to be worshiped as a war god. Traces of his warlike character remained, however, in his cult at the Janus Geminus.¹³

It is obvious that Janus lost his preëminence in ritualistic worship, yet his importance in early religion is proved beyond a doubt by the fact that in nearly all rituals his name preceded that of other deities, and that it held this position for a length of time sufficient to make it fixed and unchanged throughout the whole period of Roman religion.¹⁴

¹² Dion. of Hal. 2, 71; Gell. 4, 6, 1.

¹³ *J.* Chapt. VI.

¹⁴ *J.* Chapt. II.

CHAPTER II

PRAYERS AND FORMULAS

Among the religious formulas in which Janus holds an important place may be mentioned the most ancient piece of Latin literature extant, the hymn of the Salian priests. Janus is celebrated in a set of verses called *Ianuli*.¹ Varro and Quintilian say that in their time² the words were unintelligible even to priests. Varro gives them as follows: cozeulodorieso omnia vero adpatula coemisse ian cusianes duonus ceruses dunus ianus ve vet pom elios eum recun. divum empta cante, divum deo supplicante.³ Professor Allen in his *Remnants of Early Latin* gives the "least desperate" of the lines referring to Janus thus:

Divom * empta cante, divom deo supplicate,
..... omina vero
adpatula coemisse Iani cusianes:
duonus cerus es, duonus Ianus.⁴

Macrobius says that Janus is called *deorum deus* in the "most ancient song of the Salians."⁵ The first line, therefore, must refer to Janus. The other three lines Professor Allen renders, "The curiones of Janus have in truth perceived clear omens: thou art the good creator, good Janus." In Paulus-Festus also the word *cerus* is translated creator.⁶ Therefore these lines include Janus among the gods of generation. It is to be noted also that, at the remote time when the song was formulated, Janus was of sufficient importance to be hailed as "god of gods."

The rustic rituals described by Cato furnish other prayers in which Janus holds first place. This hardy old advocate of the simple life prescribes that a sacrifice be offered to Ceres before harvest. Careful directions are given: As a preliminary, wine and incense were offered to Janus, to Jupiter and to Juno with prayers; then the cakes called *strues* were presented to Janus with the petition that he be propitious *mihi, liberisque meis, domo, familiaeque meae*. Next a cake called

¹ Fest. 3.

² Quintil. *Instit. Orat.* 1, 6, 40; Varro. *L. L.* 7, 2-3.

³ Varro *L. L.* 7, 26-27.

⁴ Allen *Remn. of Early Lat.* p. 74.

⁵ Macrob. 1, 9, 14.

⁶ Fest. 122.

ferctum was offered to Jupiter with the same prayer. Then wine was again poured out to Janus and to Jupiter, each time with a repetition of the formula. At length the pig was slain in honor of the patiently waiting Ceres. After that, cakes and wine had to be presented to Janus and to Jupiter in the same order as before, with the same prayer.⁷ In the ceremony for the lustration of the fields, Cato directs that the beasts of the *suovetaurilia* be driven around the plot of ground to be purified, and wine be offered to Janus and to Jupiter, the prayer being addressed to Mars alone.⁸

In the formula for self-devotion, *devotio*, as given by Livy, Janus holds the first place.⁹ But in the formula which Macrobius gives for devoting a city of the enemy, his name is not mentioned.¹⁰ The prayer of the fetial priests, when demanding restitution, follows two methods of procedure. In the beginning the priests invoked Jupiter alone; in the latter part of the formula they called upon Jupiter, Janus and Quirinus by name, and summed up the other gods thus: *dique omnes caelestes terrestres, inferni*.¹¹ In the last of these formulas it is noteworthy that Jupiter, not Janus, comes first. The reason must be that the fetial priests, when using the formula, were acting as attendants of Jupiter, the god of the whole Alban people. The preëminence of this deity, then, was due to his importance to the League. His place in the list of gods, in other words, was determined by his relation to the matter in hand.

In the song of the Arvals,¹² which, like that of the Salians, had been handed down from remote antiquity by word of mouth, and had very probably become unintelligible in classical times, the name of Janus does not appear. He had a place however, in the rites of the brotherhood. Pliny¹³ and Gellius¹⁴ give the information that the order was founded by Romulus. The priesthood seems to have been devoted

⁷ Cato *R. R.* 134.

⁸ Cato *R. R.* 141.

⁹ Liv. 8, 9.

¹⁰ Macrobius 3, 9, 9-10.

¹¹ Liv. 1, 32; Polyb. 3, 25, 6; (in the prayer in Verg. *Aen.* 12, 176 sqq., Janus does not come first, but it is to be noted that many of the deities are Greek. Cf. Servius on line 198.)

¹² *CIL.* I, 28; VI, 2104, ll. 32-38; Henzen *Act. Frat. Arv.* pp. cciv; 26-27.

¹³ Plin. *N. H.* 18, 2, 6.

¹⁴ Gell. 7, 7.

originally to the service of the Dea Dia, and the ceremonies appear to have concerned the fertility of the fields.¹⁵ After having fallen into decay during the late republic, and having been revived by Augustus, the brotherhood took upon itself the duty of offering prayers and sacrifices for the safety of the emperor, of his family and of the whole state. They met for this purpose on different occasions, such as the birthday of the emperor,¹⁶ or of one of his family,¹⁷ on his return from a journey,¹⁸ and annually on January third.¹⁹ Their principal meeting place was the grove of Dea Dia outside Rome. In this grove have been found some of the "minutes of their meetings" carved in stone.²⁰ From these inscriptions comes most of the information about the priests and their ceremonies. The fullest account of their ritual is in the *Acta* of the time of Elagabalus, about 218 A.D.²¹ The ancient nature of the cult is shown by the fact that, when iron was brought into the grove, to prune trees, or to cut inscriptions, a piacular sacrifice had to be made.²² On the occasion of an offering of this sort, or of one made to avert an evil omen, such as the falling of a tree,²³ the deities invoked were the regular state gods, beginning with Janus and ending with Vesta. But the name of Dea Dia herself preceded the whole list. She must have held this important place because the sacrifice was held in her grove and in her honor, just as Jupiter took precedence of the other gods in the ritual which concerned the whole Alban people. When, however, the priests made a vow, or performed a sacrifice, for the emperor, they invoked the triad Jupiter, Juno and Minerva,²⁴ and sometimes the Genius of the emperor,²⁵ the Juno of the empress,²⁶ and such late abstractions as

¹⁵ Varro *L. L.* 5, 85; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 74; 105; Henzen *Act. Frat. Arv.* pp. i-ix; Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* pp. 143, 195, 562.

¹⁶ *CIL.* VI, 2025, a, I, line 1; 2030, lines 22-24; 2041, line 30.

¹⁷ *CIL.* VI, 2024 f., line 3; 2041, line 16.

¹⁸ *CIL.* VI, 2042, line 26.

¹⁹ *CIL.* VI, 2025, lines 13 sqq.; 2028, lines 1-15; 2040, lines 13-22; 2041, lines 35-48.

²⁰ *CIL.* VI, 2023-2119;

²¹ *CIL.* VI, 2104.

²² *CIL.* VI, 2068 column 2, lines 37-38; 2104, lines 40-42; 2107, lines 24-25; (Cf. Macrobian 5, 19, 13; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 448).

²³ *CIL.* VI, 2028, c, lines 21-23; 2053, lines 14-21.

²⁴ *CIL.* VI, 2037, line 9; 2039, lines 8-9.

²⁵ *CIL.* VI, 2037, line 10; 2043, II, line 10.

²⁶ *CIL.* VI, 2043, II, line 10.

Salus,²⁷ Victoria,²⁸ and Pax.²⁹ Dea Dia was occasionally named after Jupiter, Juno and Minerva,³⁰ but often she was left out altogether,³¹ even though the priesthood and the grove in which they met were hers. Here, again, the order in which the deities were invoked was determined by their relative importance to the ceremony. In the ritual of emperor-worship Jupiter preceded the other gods, probably because the deifying of the emperor was a strange reversion to the cult of the human Jupiter.³² With him were associated the two goddesses of the Etruscan triad, and other deities who were especially connected with the emperor. The cult of the *Fratres Arvales*, as revealed in these inscriptions, seems to show a grafting of the worship of the human Jupiter upon that of the Dea Dia. In the branch of the cult concerned with the emperor, Jupiter and his group of deities are worshiped almost exclusively; in the part concerned with the Dea Dia, Janus occupies his usual position, heading the list of gods. But the list itself is preceded by the name of Dea Dia, who is the important factor in the ritual.³³

To sum up, then, the name of Janus regularly preceded that of other gods. And when a sacrifice was performed to any deity, a preliminary offering was usually made to Janus. Ovid expressly mentions this fact:

. Cur, quamvis aliorum numina placem,
Iane, tibi primum tura merumque fero?³⁴

When another deity than Janus comes first, the changed order is due to some peculiar importance of that deity to the particular rite. Janus must have gained this precedence because of his importance to all Roman ritual at the time when the religion was crystallizing.

On the other hand, the name of Vesta was regularly placed at the end of a complete list. To account for this the Romans fabricated many theories which, needless to say, cannot be used as evidence without careful sifting. The explanation most readily occurring to their minds was an analogical one. Janus is the door, and Vesta, the hearth, there-

²⁷ *CIL*. VI, 2039, line 9.

²⁸ *CIL*. VI, 2051, line 38.

²⁹ *CIL*. VI, 2044, line 12.

³⁰ *CIL*. VI, 2028.

³¹ *CIL*. VI, 2041, lines 4-48; 2042, lines 1-16.

³² *J.* Chapt. VII.

³³ Cf. *CIL*. VIII, S. 11797 and note.

³⁴ *Ov. F.* 1, 171-172; cf. *Serv. Aen.* 1, 292; *J.* p. 58.

fore Janus is invoked first and Vesta last.³⁵ Janus has charge of entrances, therefore he is used as passage-way to the other gods.³⁶ He comes first because he is the god of generation,³⁷ or because he is the inventor of speech.³⁸ The variety of reasons given shows that they were simply made up to account for a phenomenon not understood. The conclusion may be drawn, however, after considering the rituals here mentioned, that Janus did not occupy his position at the head of some formulas, because he was god of beginnings, any more than did Jupiter and Dea Dia hold a similar position in other formulas because they were deities of beginnings, nor any more than did Vesta have her place at the end of prayers because she was goddess of endings. The true explanation must be that because of their relative importance in respect to the other deities Janus came to hold the first place, and Vesta, the place next in importance, the last. A few recitations of a prayer, at the time when religion was in the formative period, would serve to fix the order. When once it had become established, religious conservatism, which was especially strong among the Romans, would require that it be kept. Indeed, the order of service became so stereotyped that calling on Janus and Vesta became a synonym for praying.³⁹ It will be necessary to consider this subject further in the following Chapter.

³⁵ Cic. *N. D.* 2, 27, 67.

³⁶ Macrobian. 1, 9, 9; Ov. *F.* 1, 171-174.

³⁷ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 2.

³⁸ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610.

³⁹ Juv. 6, 386; Hor. *Epist.* 1, 16, 59. cf. Arnob. 3, 29; S. Aug. *C. D.* 4, 23; *J.* Chapt. VII, pp. 57-59.

CHAPTER III

THE PLACE OF JANUS AS GOD OF BEGINNINGS

In modern works on mythology, Janus is commonly described as a god of beginnings. One quotation will illustrate this view. Mommsen says: "The facts, that gates and doors and the morning (*Ianus matutinus*) were sacred to Ianus, and that he was always invoked before any other god and was even represented in the series of coins before Jupiter and the other gods, indicate unmistakably that he was the abstraction of opening and beginning."¹ It is the purpose of this Chapter to show that in no ritual was Janus worshiped as god of beginnings. It is true that originally he was the *numen* of the door-opening,² and in the conventional list of deities he came first.³ But neither of these facts makes him a god of beginnings.

There is no doubt, however, that the Romans did consider a good beginning of great importance. Ovid has the statement,

Omina principiis inesse solent.⁴

This line is put in the mouth of Janus, but, nevertheless, he claims for himself no honors at the beginnings of undertakings; he gives this statement only as a reason why propitious words are to be spoken on New Year's Day, and makes the further explanation,

Ad primam vocem timidas advertitis aures,⁵

These lines simply refer to the well-known fact that the first words of an oracle and the first birds of an omen meant more than any which followed. In accordance with this view, if a sacrifice proved unsatisfactory, or the victim escaped, and a second offering had to be made, the omen was never considered so bright as when the first sacrifice turned out favorably. It was, therefore, a euphemism to call the second victim *melior hostia*.⁶ Another example of the importance of a good beginning is found in the custom of lifting a bride over the threshold of her new home. To stumble on the threshold at any time was unfortunate, to

¹ Mommsen *Hist. I*, p. 213, note; cf. Carter *Relig. Life of Anc. Rome*, p. 10.

² *J.* Chapt. I.

³ *J.* Chapt. II.

⁴ *Ov. F.* 1, 178; cf. *Ov. F.* 1, 187-188.

⁵ *Ov. F.* 1, 179.

⁶ Verg. *Aen.* 5, 483. cf. however, Servius' note on this passage.

do so when entering for the first time was calamitous. But, in spite of this common belief, there is no case on record of an invocation to Janus at the beginning of married life. Evidently, in matrimonial affairs, at least, his intervention was not considered essential to a good beginning. In this, as in other ceremonies, he would be invoked first, if the prayer was offered to the regular state deities. His aid was not, however, sought for the beginning, but he was called upon first because the first place in the list of gods was his by long-established custom. As another example may be cited the incident in Livy 22, 3, 11-12. Flaminius was thrown from his horse before an engagement with the enemy. His soldiers were terrified, *velut foedo omine incipiendae rei*. In spite, however, of this terror at the ill-omened beginning, there is no account given of an appeal to Janus to make the next starting more propitious. If Janus were god of beginnings, some mention of his lack of favor would be expected in such instances as these.

If he had been patron of commencement, there are other situations, too, in which he would necessarily have to figure. For instance, in that case, he ought to have been patron of the first of the arbitrary divisions of time: sacrifices in his honor would be looked for at dawn, on the first day of the new year, and on the first day of each month; and the first month of the year would be sacred to him. None of these things was true. In the first place, it is a well-known fact that in the old Roman calendar the first month was sacred, not to Janus, but to Mars.⁷ In 153 B.C. the consuls began to enter upon their office in January, and, because the years were designated by consuls, it became customary to consider January the first month of the year.⁸ But the religious year continued to be reckoned from the first of March. The order of months, then, was certainly not due to the character of Janus. It might almost be said to have been by accident that the month called by his name came to be the first.

As for January first, Macrobius thought that it was a day sacred to Janus, he said that men invoked him *Iunonium quasi non solum*

⁷ Auson. *Eclog.* 376, 3; 377, 5-6; Paulus-Fest. 150; Lyd. *Mens.* 1, 16; Macrob. 1, 12, 3; 1, 15, 18; Ov. *F.* 1, 27-44; 2, 47-54; 3, 75-154; 4, 25-26; 5, 423-424; Plut. *Numa* 18; 19; *Q. R.* 19; Serv. *Georg.* 1, 43; 1, 217; Solin. 1, 34-40; Varro *L. L.* 6, 33-34.

⁸ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* p. 33; (Fowler does not admit that the month of January was certainly named for Janus).

mensis Ianuarii sed mensium omnium ingressus tenentem.⁹ He seems to be taking this for granted, basing his opinion on the name only. But at any rate, he mentions no offering to Janus. The Praenestine Calendar notes a sacrifice to Vediovis and to Aesculapius on the first of January.¹⁰ In the private celebration of the day the exchange of gifts was an important feature.¹¹ These presents had nothing to do with Janus. Their very name *strenae* seems to have been taken from another deity, *Strenia*.¹² Ovid says that the sweetmeats which formed a large part of the gifts were intended to make the whole year pleasant.¹³ This custom was in accordance with the belief that the beginning of anything determined the character of the whole.¹⁴ On this theory, also, was based the caution to speak only words of good omen on the first day of the year.¹⁵ For the same reason, some part of the daily tasks was performed, although this was a festal day, in order to secure industry throughout the year.¹⁶ In all this Janus had no part. In the stately ceremonies of inaugurating the new consuls, as Ovid describes them, incense was burned, a procession of men in white ascended the Capitol, and white bullocks, whose necks had never felt a yoke, were sacrificed to Jupiter.¹⁷ Lydus says that the consul, dressed in white and riding a white horse, led the procession to the Capitol. After sacrificing his horse to Jupiter, he donned the *toga consularis*, and departed.¹⁸ Jupiter is the god here honored. It is doubtful whether Janus had even his conventional place at the head of the list of gods invoked; for it is quite possible that the deities concerned with this ceremony were the Capitoline triad—Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. This trinity seems to belong to a different category from the list of divinities which began with Janus and ended with Vesta.¹⁹

⁹ Macrob. 1, 9, 16.

¹⁰ *CIL*. I, p. 312.

¹¹ Mart. 8, 33, 11-12; 13, 27; Ov. *F.* 1, 185-186.

¹² S. Aug. *C. D.* 4, 11; 4, 16; Paulus-Fest. 293; Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 4 says that the *strena* were laurel leaves used in honor of a goddess of the name, who was a Victory.

¹³ Ov. *F.* 1, 185-188.

¹⁴ *J.* pp. 11-12.

¹⁵ Ov. *F.* 1, 175.

¹⁶ Ov. *F.* 1, 165-170.

¹⁷ Ov. *F.* 1, 71-88.

¹⁸ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 3.

¹⁹ Cf. *J.* pp. 7-10.

The name of Janus, as has been seen, is not mentioned in the accounts of the private or of the public celebrations of New Year's Day. If, even at some remote time, Janus had had any sacrifice on the first day of his own month, it can hardly be supposed that it would have been so completely obscured by these later ceremonies as to have been lost even to memory. In this case, silence is almost equivalent to proof of non-existence.

Nevertheless, the dignified ceremonies connected with the inauguration of the new officers gave a peculiarly patriotic and religious significance to the first day of the year, and this reflected back to Janus, because his name was attached to the month. The character of this association can be examined in the following passages. Ovid has the line,

Ecce tibi faustum, Germanice, (Ianus) nuntiat annum.²⁰

Germanicus is about to enter upon his consulship on the first of January, therefore Janus was said to announce to him the opening of the year. In Statius, *Silvae* 4, 1, 2 Germanicus opens the year,

Insignemque aperit Germanicus annum,

and in 4, 2, 60-61 the same flatterer hopes that Domitian may often so usher in the new year, and salute Janus,

. saepe annua pandas
Limina, saepe novo Ianum lictore salutes.

Claudianus makes Janus open the year,

Iamque novum fastis aperit felicibus annum.²¹

So either the new consul, whose name will be used to fix the date, or Janus, whose month begins all years, may be celebrated by the poets as the opener of the year.

Martial represents Janus as the bestower of the honors assumed on the first of his month, in 8, 66, 11-12,

Quorum pacificus ter ampliavit
Ianus nomina,

and in 11, 4, 5-6,

Et qui purpureis iam tertia nomina fastis,
Iane, refers Nervae.

²⁰ Ov. *F.* 1, 63.

²¹ Claudian. *VI Cons. Hon.* 28, 640.

Ianus is here little more than a personification of *Ianuarius mensis*. The following lines, which Janus is represented as saying to Domitian might seem, if taken alone, to give the name of the deity a deeper religious significance:

Salve, magne parens mundi, qui saecula mecum
 instaurare paras: talem te cernere semper
 mense meo tua Roma cupit
 da gaudia fastis
 continua.²²

but, on comparison with the foregoing, they may be paraphrased thus: "You and I open the year. Rome desires always to see you assume the consulship in my month." The connection between Janus and the ceremonies of January first may be still further illustrated by these lines from the *Carmina Tria de Mensibus*:

Hic Iani mensis sacer est: en aspice ut aris
 tura micent, sumant ut pia liba Lares.
 Annorum saeclicque caput, natalis honorum
 purpureos fastis qui numerat proceres.²³

which may mean, "This is the sacred month of January—sacred because of the ceremonies. January is the beginning of the year, because the purple-clad chiefs date their office from that month." Although *Ianus* is used here only as a personification of his month, yet some sanctity is reflected to the god himself from the ceremonies of the day. From the lines just quoted, it seems evident that *Fastorum genitor parensque*²⁴ means only, "Janus, i. e. January, is the beginning of the year, a fact to be emphasized by patriotic Romans, because the consuls assumed, or renewed, office on January first." And *Annorum nitidique sator pulcherrime mundi*²⁵ has about the same significance.

In Nemesianus, *Cynegetica* 104-105 the connection is still more clear,

. cum Ianus, temporis auctor,
 Pandit inocciduum bisseis mensibus aevum.

Ausonius, in a poem celebrating his own consulship, calls the year itself "father of events," that is, "father of dates."

²² Stat. *Silv.* 4, 1, 17-21.

²³ Bährens *Poet. Lat. Min.* I, p. 206, 12, 1-4.

²⁴ Mart. 8, 2, 1.

²⁵ Mart. 10, 28, 1.

Anne, pater rerum,²⁶

In the following lines Janus is the beginner of the year in the same sense,

Ergo ubi, Iane biceps, longum reseraveris annum.²⁷

Nec tu dux mensum, Iane biformis, eras,²⁸

Primus Romanas ordiris, Iane, Kalendas,²⁹

When the word *Ianus* is used as it is here, it is difficult to determine whether there is any reference to the god himself, beyond the personification of his month. In the following, *Ianus* has no significance at all except as it means the month.

Possidet hunc Iani sic dea mense diem,³⁰

Ianus finem habet.³¹

The month of December is also personified in,

(Decembris) Poteras non cedere Iano,

Gaudia si nobis quae dabit ille dares.³²

Ausonius, in *Eclogue* 378, 4, uses the names both of Janus and of Mars, in place of the names of their months,

. . . . Iani Martisque Kalendis.

The same process of personification is in force when Ovid says to Janus *tuis Kalendis*.³³ That these words do not imply that all Kalends were sacred to Janus, but that they simply give the date as January first, is made still more certain by the fact that the same words are used by Tibullus when addressing Mars,

Sulpicia est tibi culta tuis, Mars magne, Kalendis.³⁴

The preceding argument as to the extent to which Janus was leader of the procession of time, can be strengthened by another bit of evidence. The line quoted above,

²⁶ Auson. *Edyl.* 9, 333, 5.

²⁷ Ov. *Pont.* 4, 4, 23.

²⁸ Ov. *F.* 5, 424.

²⁹ Auson. *Eclog.* 376, 1.

³⁰ Mart. 7, 8, 5-6.

³¹ Ov. *F.* 1, 586.

³² Ov. *F.* 2, 1.

³³ Ov. *F.* 1, 175.

³⁴ Tibull. 4, 2, 1.

Iamque novum fastis aperit felicibus annum³⁵

may be compared with *Georgics* 1, 217-218, where Vergil uses the same expression of the constellation Taurus, the rising of which on March first marks the beginning of the farmer's year,

Candidus auratis aperit cum cornibus annum
Taurus.

Janus, who opened the year in the passage from Claudianus, was no more a god of beginnings than was Taurus, in the line from Vergil. Both lines are poetic ways of saying "the year begins."

It is generally supposed that the first day of each month was sacred to Janus.³⁶ It has just been seen that such expressions as *tuis Kalendis* can not be taken as evidence for this belief. There are, however, two passages on which this theory might be based. Macrobius asserts (*invocamus*) Iunonium quasi non solum mensis Ianuarii sed mensium omnium ingressus tenentem; in dicione autem Iunonis sunt omnes Kalendae, unde et Varro libro quinto *Rerum Divinarum* scribit Iano duodecim aras pro totidem mensibus dedicatas.³⁷ Lydus quoted Varro for the statement that a kind of cake was offered to Janus on the Kalends.³⁸ Nowhere else but in these two passages is Janus made the god of the Kalends. It is to be noted that Macrobius mentions no offering to Janus, nor any ritual performed in his honor. The passage in Lydus is the only reference to any kind of offering to Janus on that day (except as he might appear in his conventional place at the head of the list of gods). It may be that Lydus is quoting Varro only for the first part of his statement and he may be adding "the Kalends" of his own accord, for the other passages which mention the cake say nothing about an offering of it on this day.³⁹ At any rate, Lydus, a late Greek writer, full of fanciful allusions, is no very reliable authority on Roman religion. It is evident that Macrobius puts Janus in charge of the Kalends only

³⁵ Claudian. *VI Cons. Hon.* 28, 640: other passages in which *Ianus* is used for *Ianuarius* are: Auson. *Eclog.* 375, 6; 381, 6; 382, 1; *Edyl.* 8, 332 *passim*; *Epist.* 19, 409, 7-8; Mart. 9, 1, 1-2; 10, 41, 1; 12, 31, 4; 13, 27. *Ianus* is used in the plural to mean recurring consulships: Auson. *Epigr.* 147, 7, Tu quoque venturos per longum consere Ianos. Cf. Auson. *Epist.* 20, 410, 13.

³⁶ Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 103.

³⁷ Macrobius. 1, 9, 16.

³⁸ Lydus *Mens.* 4, 2.

³⁹ *CIL.* 1, p. 312; Paulus-Fest. 104; cf. *J.* pp. 41-42.

as a means of explaining the epithet Junonius. In another passage he explains it by analogy: a qua etiam Ianum Iunonium cognominatum diximus, quod illi deo omnis ingressus, huic deae cuncti Kalendarum dies videntur adscripti.⁴⁰ This quotation certainly does not convey the impression that the Kalends were sacred to Janus, any more than entrances were to Juno. Servius says that Janus had the title Junonius because Juno once opened the gates of war,⁴¹ and Lydus, because he is the air.⁴² A comparison of these passages shows that they are nothing but guesses made to explain the epithet, and that they are useless as evidence for the character of the god.⁴³

Of the ritual of the first day of the month, both Varro and Macrobius give full accounts, which it is worth while to quote. In Varro, *Lingua Latina* 6, 27, we find, Primi dies mensium nominati Kalendae, quod his diebus calantur eius mensis Nonae a pontificibus, quintanae an septimanae sint futurae, in Capitolio in Curia Calabra sic dicto quinquies Kalo Iuno Covella, septies dicto Kalo Iuno Covella. Macrobius 1, 15, 9-10 gives a fuller account, Priscis ergo temporibus antequam fasti a Cn. Flavio scriba invitis Patribus in omnium notitiam proderentur, pontifici minori haec provincia delegabatur ut novae lunae primum observaret aspectum visamque regi sacrificulo nuntiaret. Itaque sacrificio a rege et minore pontifice celebrato idem pontifex calata, id est vocata, in Capitolium plebe iuxta Curiam Calabram quot numero dies a Kalendis ad Nonas superessent pronuntiabat. Later on, when treating of the rites of Juno, the same author says: Romae quoque Kalendis omnibus, praeter quod pontifex minor in Curia Calabra rem divinam Iunoni facit, etiam regina sacrorum, id est regis uxor, porcam vel agnam in regia Iunoni immolavit.⁴⁴ It has been supposed⁴⁵ that this offering was made to Janus, on the assumption that the *rex sacrorum* was a priest of Janus. But if the *rex sacrorum* was not a priest of Janus, as will be maintained in Chapter VII, this argument is disposed of. The strongest evidence for the lack of any sacrifice to Janus on the Kalends is the absence of any reference to such a ceremony. It seems

⁴⁰ Macrob. 1, 15, 19.

⁴¹ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610; cf. Arnob. 6, 25.

⁴² Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1.

⁴³ *J.* pp. 66-67.

⁴⁴ Macrob. 1, 15, 19.

⁴⁵ Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 103.

hardly probably that, when Macrobius mentions on two occasions the ceremonies of Juno, he would have failed to speak of those of Janus, had he known of any. In 1, 15, 18, also, where he says that the Kalends belonged to Juno and the Ides to Jupiter, he would naturally be expected to mention Janus, if the two-faced god had had anything to do with either of these days. Ovid, too, remarks on the power of Jupiter and Juno over the Ides and Kalends respectively,

Vindicat Ausonias Iunonis cura Kalendas,
Idibus alba Iovi grandior agna cadit.⁴⁶

Seven lines below he invokes Janus:

Ecce tibi faustum, Germanice, nuntiat annum
inque meo primus carmine Ianus adest.
Iane, biceps etc.

Certainly in the first two lines the power of Janus over the Kalends, if he had any, would be appropriately mentioned, in view, especially, of the invocation of that deity. In the absence of any reference to an offering to Janus, on this day, the only reasonable conclusion is that there was none. And, in that case, Janus cannot be considered a god of the Kalends.

As in the case of the Kalends and of New Year's day, there is no record of an offering to Janus at dawn.⁴⁷ It might be well to consider some passages on which is often based the conclusion that he was god of the morning. In *Fasti* 1, 125, Ovid puts these words into the mouth of Janus:

Praesideo foribus caeli cum mitibus Horis.

In the first place, the reference to the hours is purely Greek, not a Roman conception at all; in the second place, there is no reason for supposing that the hours are those of early morning exclusively. Servius also makes Janus lord of the day in about the same sense: *Alii eum (Janum) diei dominum volunt in quo ortus est et occasus.*⁴⁸ It is to be noted here that Janus is god of the closing, as well as of the opening of the day, and that this statement may equally well be taken as authority for the supposition that he was god of the evening. These

⁴⁶ *Ov. F.* 1, 55-56; Cf. *ibid.* 1, 185-186.

⁴⁷ Carter *Relig. Life of Anc. Rome* p. 10; Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 109; *J.* beginning of Chapt. III, quotation from Mommsen.

⁴⁸ *Serv. Aen.* 7, 607.

passages imply nothing more than the exaltation of the door-god into a cosmic deity, the process which affected all the important deities.⁴⁹

But the most important passage, on which to found a belief in Janus as "Father of the Morning" is, of course, Horace *Satires* 2, 6, 20-35.

Matutine pater, seu Iane libentius audis,
unde homines operum primos vitaeque labores
instituunt, sic dis placitum, tu carminis esto
principium. Romae sponsorem me rapis.
.....
..... Ante secundam
Roscius orabat sibi adesses ad Puteal cras.

The epithet *Matutinus* is applied to Janus only this one time. It does not occur in the list of his titles given in Lydus, *de Mensibus* 4, 1; nor in Macrobius 1, 9, 15; nor in Servius, *ad Aeneidem* 7, 610. Before a decision on the meaning of the title as given in Horace can be reached, it is necessary to compare this passage with similar expressions found elsewhere. The adjective *Matutinus* is applied to Jupiter once, in Martial 4, 8, 11-12,

..... gressu timet ire licenti
ad matutinum nostra Thalia Iovem.

which, as the whole poem shows, clearly means, "Our Thalia is afraid to approach Jupiter (i. e. Domitian) in the morning." Hardly would anyone interpret it as meaning "Jupiter father of the morning."⁵⁰ Compare with this, also, such an expression as this of Horace,

..... vespertinus pete tectum.⁵¹

"Go home in the evening." It is possible that the quality suggested by *matutinus* may be no more a permanent attribute of Janus, than of Jupiter, or than *vespertinus* is of the man addressed in *Epistle* 1, 6. After considering the other lines of the quotation, it will be possible to come back to this with a clearer view.

It is well known that lawyers congregated in the Forum near the *Janus Geminus*. *Rapis*, consequently, may mean, "you, Janus, hurry me off to attend to business near your arch." The *ad Puteal*

⁴⁹ Isid. 5, 33, 3; Macrobius. 1, 9, 2; 1, 9, 9; 1, 13, 3; Suid. s. v.

⁵⁰ See, however, Linde *De Iano Summo Romanorum Deo*, Acta Universitatis Lundensis 27, p. 37.

⁵¹ Hor. *Epist.* 1, 6, 20.

refers, also, to the business section of the Forum. Ovid couples the two together in the line,

Qui Puteal Ianumque timet, celeresque Kalendas.⁵²

The *unde homines operum primos vitaeque labores instituunt* may, then, have no reference to Janus as god of beginnings, but may have two meanings "from you (i.e. near your arch) men receive the first tasks of the day; and, from you (i.e. as father of men) men receive the burden of life." In *tu carminis esto Principium*, the poet may be giving merely the conventional setting to his poem. Janus was regularly invoked first in any formula. To interpret this invocation and the *Matulinus pater* as humorous expressions would be in accordance with the spirit of the Satire. If these conjectures have any weight, the four lines together mean, "Father of early-rising business men, or Janus, if thou preferest, near whose arch men begin the toils of day, and from whom they receive the burden of life, as it suits the gods; do thou, as patron of lawyers, begin my song. When I am in Rome, thou hurriest me off early in the morning as a witness . . . Before the second hour, Roscius asks you to come to his assistance at the Puteal." None of these lines specifies Janus as god of beginnings. Furthermore, Servius, in quoting the words *Matutine pater* uses them as evidence that Janus was god of the closing as well as of the opening of the day.⁵³ Whether or not this interpretation be correct, there remains the argument, that, at least, there is no mention of any ritual performed in honor of Janus at dawn. And since it is the religious ceremonies which determine the character of a deity, there is no ground for considering Janus the "Father of the Morning."

It has been shown that Janus was not the god of the first day of the year, nor of the first day of the month, nor of the first month of the year in the early calendar, nor of the first hours of the day. It is, indeed, a strange coincidence that this deity should have had so many characteristics which can be construed by analogy to mean that he was patron of the commencement of things—the first month of the year was, in the later calendar, called by his name; the ceremonies of the inauguration of officers brought to him a sort of connection with the dating of the year; one epithet, *Junonius*, seemed to connect him with the

⁵² Ov. *Rem. Am.* 561; cf. Hor. *Epist.* 1, 1, 54; *Sat.* 2, 3, 18-19.

⁵³ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 607.

Kalends; another epithet, *Matutinus*, appeared to associate him with the dawn. Added to all this was the fact that he was invoked usually first in prayers. Two lines from Martial may serve to illustrate the process by which modern mythologists have come to the conclusion that Janus was god of beginnings:

Annorum nitidique sator pulcherrime mundi,
publica quem primum vota precesque vocant.⁵⁴

To make the door-god a deity presiding over all beginnings would explain these words easily. He would then be a beginner of time, of the universe and of prayers. But the interpretation based on the preceding argument would be—*annorum sator*, because the civil year began with his month; *mundi sator*, an exaltation of Janus into a world deity, a process which was applied by the poets and philosophers to all the great divinities. The second line states the fact so often quoted, that Janus was usually invoked first in prayers. As another example, the words of Septimius Serenus: *o principium deorum*,⁵⁵ do not mean that among the gods Janus was the beginner, but only that he was the first of the gods. When Arnobius says *Incipiamus ergo solemniter ab Iano*,⁵⁶ he is only mocking the conventional custom of beginning prayers with the name of Janus. He is about to consider the claims to divinity which might be advanced by the different inhabitants of the pagan pantheon; he will discuss the deities in due order *solemniter* and will, therefore, begin, as the unconverted Romans do, with Janus. St. Augustine, too, seems to be ridiculing the heathen ritual when he says, *Ianus, igitur, a quo sumpsit exordium*.⁵⁷ In Paulus-Festus is the statement *Fuerit omnium primus: cui primo supplicabant veluti parenti, et a quo rerum omnium factum putabant initium*.⁵⁸ The last clause in this passage is merely a summary of the other two: "Janus comes first of the gods, prayers are addressed to him first, therefore the opinion is that everything began with him, that is, that he was the creator of the universe." This is not equivalent to saying that beginnings were sacred to him. Strangely enough, Cicero makes somewhat the same statement about Jupiter: *Imitemur ergo Aratum, qui magnis de rebus*

⁵⁴ Mart. 10, 28, 1-2.

⁵⁵ Septim. Seren. frag. 1, 2 (Lemaire *Poet. Lat. Min.* p. 633).

⁵⁶ Arnob. 3, 29.

⁵⁷ S. Aug. C. D. 7, 7.

⁵⁸ Paulus-Fest. 52.

dicere exordiens a Iove incipiendum putat ut rite ab eo dicendi principia capiamus, quem unum regem esse omnes . . . consentiunt.⁵⁹ This honor to be paid to Jupiter did not seem to Cicero to be interfering with the prerogatives of Janus. In short, there is no record of Janus being invoked at the beginning of undertakings, any more than were other gods; no ceremonies were performed in his honor at the beginning of the arbitrary divisions of time; no first fruits were sacred to him. He simply headed the list of gods.

After this attempted explanation of the extent to which Janus was god of beginnings, it might be interesting to turn to some of the theories advanced by the Romans themselves. It will be seen that even these ancients did not by any means agree that the position of this deity at the head of the list of gods, and that the place of his month at the beginning of the year were due to any power of his over beginnings. As a reason for his heading the list of gods Macrobius gives: ut per eum pateat ad illum cui immolatur accessus, quasi preces supplicium per portas suas ad deos ipse transmittat.⁶⁰ The resemblance of Janus to a door-way seemed to this author sufficient reason for addressing him first. Cicero has much the same opinion, principem in sacrificando Ianum esse voluerunt, quod ab eundo nomen est ductum.⁶¹ Ovid, also, says:

. . . . "Cur quamvis aliorum numina placem,
Iane, tibi primum tura merumque fero?"
"Ut possis aditum per me, qui limina servo,
ad quoscumque voles," inquit "habere deos."⁶²

St. Augustine was puzzled by the fact that Janus preceded Jupiter, although Jupiter seemed to be the higher of the two deities; he attempted to explain this by saying, quoniam penes Ianum sunt prima, penes Iovem summa.⁶³ Servius thought that Janus was inventor of speech, and for this reason came first in the prayers which men addressed to the gods.⁶⁴ St. Augustine was apparently much impressed by the possibility of drawing comparisons between Janus, the beginner, and

⁵⁹ Cic. *Rep.* 1, 36, 56; cf. Hor. *Od.* 1, 12, 13.

⁶⁰ Macrobius. 1, 9, 9.

⁶¹ Cic. *N. D.* 2, 27, 67.

⁶² Ovid. *F.* 1, 171-174.

⁶³ St. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 9; *J.* p. 63, 64.

⁶⁴ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610.

Terminus, the ender.⁶⁵ This was reasonable, too, for surely the ending of any undertaking is as important as the beginning, and, if one deity watched over the commencement, another ought to guard the outcome. But the analogy does not work out consistently. If Janus had been the beginning and Terminus the ending, then in prayers where Janus comes first, Terminus ought to come last. Such is not the case: Vesta ends the list, and Terminus never found a place on it at all. Cicero works out an analogy making Vesta last: Cumque in omnibus rebus vim haberent maximam prima et extrema, principem in sacrificando Ianum esse voluerunt Vis autem eius (Vestae) ad aras et focos pertinet. Itaque in ea dea, quod est rerum custos intimarum, omnis et precatio et sacrificatio extrema est.⁶⁶ Here the positions of Janus and Vesta, at the door and in the interior of the house respectively, correspond to their respective places at the beginning and the end of the list of deities, but Cicero does not attempt to show that their functions were the analogical ones of beginner and ender. These passages show how artificial such explanations were. There is no reference in literature to an offering either to Vesta or to Terminus as guardians of the ending of any undertaking, or to Janus as the patron of the beginning of it. These functions of the deities are merely fanciful conceptions of the rhetoricians and poets, and had no place in religion proper.

The reasons given by the Romans for making the month of Janus the beginning of the year are equally various and inconsistent. Plutarch says that Numa named the first month after Janus because he preferred to honor the god of agriculture and peaceful government rather than the god of war.⁶⁷ Varro believed it was because Janus was patron of beginnings.⁶⁸ Ovid says that it was because the first month resembled a door:

Primus enim Iani mensis, quia ianua prima est.⁶⁹

Isidorus has much the same idea: Ianuarius mensis a Iano dictus, cuius fuit a gentilibus consecratus: vel quia limes et ianua sit anni; he then goes on to say that Janus was represented with two faces because he

⁶⁵ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 7.

⁶⁶ Cic. *N. D.* 2, 27, 67.

⁶⁷ Plut. *Numa* 19; *Q. R.* 19.

⁶⁸ Varro *L. L.* 6, 34.

⁶⁹ Ov. *F.* 2, 51.

was introitus . . . et exitus anni,⁷⁰ which might imply that he was god of endings, as well as of beginnings. Suidas makes him the door-keeper of the year.⁷¹ Macrobius says that the month of the two-faced god was the end of the old and the beginning of the new year.⁷² Servius makes him the god of the year.⁷³ Ausonius, *spectans tempora bina simul*,⁷⁴ has the same thought. From these passages it appears that most of the reasons given by the Romans to explain why the month of Janus was first in the year are analogical, and that the analogy most frequently employed was that of the opening and closing door.

The place of Janus as god of beginnings may be summed up thus: After it became the custom for magistrates to enter upon their office on the first of January and this day became the first of the civil year, some honor was reflected to Janus from the ceremonies then performed. Furthermore his name was often used as a synonym for his month. In consequence of these two facts, he is often hailed as the beginning of time. This title always means that he is the beginning of the secular year. But, as the Romans became familiar with abstract ideas, some conception of beginning may have been attached to Janus. Such a notion may have been strengthened by the fact that Janus was invoked in prayers before the other gods and by such analogies as the following: *Ianua autem est primus domus ingressus, dicta quia Iano consecratum est omne principium*.⁷⁵ It is to be noted, however, that this is the only one of the passages which states definitely that Janus was god of beginnings. When philosophy brought to the Romans nobler religious conceptions and caused them to raise their deities to a loftier plane than that of the earlier *numina*, Janus, like Jupiter, became a cosmic deity.⁷⁶ He was the source of all things,⁷⁷ the generator of all life,⁷⁸ or the original chaos from which all things evolved.⁷⁹ In this

⁷⁰ Isid. 5, 33, 3-4; cf. 8, 11, 37: *Ianum dictum quasi mundi vel caeli vel mensium ianuam*.

⁷¹ Suid. s. v.

⁷² Macrobius 1, 9, 9; also Herodian. 1, 16.

⁷³ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 607.

⁷⁴ Auson. *Eclog.* 377, 2.

⁷⁵ Serv. *Aen.* 1, 449.

⁷⁶ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 7; Isid. 8, 11, 37; Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 2; Ov. *F.* 1, 103-120.

⁷⁷ Mart. 10, 28, 1.

⁷⁸ Macrobius 1, 9, 16.

⁷⁹ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 2; Ov. *F.* 1, 103; 1, 111-114; Paulus-Fest. 52.

sense he was god of beginnings, but no more so than Jupiter was. The commencement of actual undertakings was never under the protection of Janus. The abstraction of beginner, or source, in this sense, never had a place in the ritual of the Romans, and even in literature such an idea is seldom applied to Janus; in fact endings are associated with him as much as are beginnings.

CHAPTER IV

STATUES OF JANUS

It is well known that the Romans did not represent their gods by statues until a comparatively late period in their history. It is said that for over a hundred and seventy years they had no images of any kind.¹ This state of affairs is attributed to Numa, who, according to the tradition, had been taught by Pythagoras that it was wrong to represent the deity in the form of man or beast. All this is, of course, mere conjecture, and is valuable only so far as it suggests that the Romans themselves thought that their statues of gods were of foreign origin. This lack of deities in human form was due, of course, not to any monotheistic piety on the part of Numa, but to lack of artistic sense among the Romans, and to the nature of their deities. Their impersonal divinities, or *numina*, were hardly distinguishable from the things in which they dwelt, and, to the primitive worshipers, these objects were sufficient symbols of the divine presence. After a time, however, partly under the influence of the Greeks, some of these *numina* developed into true anthropomorphic gods and were represented in art. But Janus was never worshiped in human form. To the end of pagan belief he remained a door-way, just as Vesta remained "naught else but living fire."² The evidence for this is the fact that, whereas of other gods statues and statuettes have been found in great numbers, and are mentioned again and again in literature, not a single statue of Janus has been unearthed, and there are references in Latin writers to only three. Evidence can be presented to show that at least two of these were not representations of Janus at all.

One of these statues was brought from Egypt by Augustus. Pliny gives the following account of it: Item Ianus pater in suo templo dicatus ab Augusto, ex Aegypto advectus, utrius (Scopae an Praxitelis) manu sit, iam quidem et auro occultatus.³ Wissowa's conjecture that this was a Hermes, and not a Janus, is entirely reasonable, since

¹ S. Aug. *C. D.* 4, 31, 2, c; Euseb. *Præp.* 9, 6; Plut. *Numa* 8; cf. Clement. Alex. *Strom.* 1, 15, 71.

² Ov. *F.* 6, 291-292.

³ Plin. *N. H.* 36, 5, 4, 28.

Hermes was often represented with two faces.⁴ Augustus either failed to recognize the true character of this statue, or else thought that it would serve as an image of one of those ancient deities, the worship of whom he was trying so hard to revive.

A statue with four faces was brought from Falerii when that city was captured by the Romans. Servius says that Domitian tore down the old arch of *Janus Geminus* in order to build a new one whose four openings should correspond to the four faces of the image: the statue which had been set up by Numa in the old arch was removed to the Forum Transitorium.⁵ Martial makes this new Janus-arch the subject of some laudatory verses.⁶ Procopius describes a four-arched passage, containing a two-faced statue.⁷ Lydus says that in his time a *Janus quadrifrons* was supposed to be standing in the Forum of Nerva.⁸ Suidas mentions a statue having on its fingers the numbers CCCLXV, standing for the number of the days of the year.⁹ Pliny contradicts some of these statements by saying that in the arch of *Janus Geminus* there was a statue which had been dedicated by Numa as a symbol of peace and war, and that its fingers were so shaped as to form the figures CCCLXV.¹⁰ On the basis of this rather confused evidence one might suppose that in the Janus-arch there was a statue of some kind; and it is possible that the first one placed there was very ancient and was, on that account, attributed to Numa. On the other hand, no writer before Pliny mentions a statue; it is also possible therefore, that the first one set up was the one brought from Egypt by Augustus. In that case, the Numa statue never could have existed, but the arch and the statue both were ascribed to that mythical king by popular tradition. If that was the case, there is mention in literature of only two statues of Janus, neither of which was originally intended to represent that deity. But this matter is difficult to settle. In the time of Pliny, at any rate, there was a two-faced statue supposed to represent Janus in the arch of *Janus*

⁴ Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 106; Hill (*Coins of Anc. Sicily* p. 208) conjectures that a Sicilian coin of about 250 B.C., having a janiform head, may be a Hermes Cf. *Head Coins of the Ancients in the British Museum* pl. 18, 20; 21.

⁵ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 607.

⁶ Mart. 10, 28.

⁷ Procop. *Bell. Goth.* 1, 20.

⁸ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1.

⁹ Suidas s. v.

¹⁰ Plin. *N. H.* 34, 7, 16, 33; Cf. *J.* pp. 41 sq.

Geminus, and on its fingers were the figures CCCLXV. This image, whether the one of Augustus, or an older one, was removed by Domitian, and a new Janus-arch with four openings was built to hold the *quadrifrons* from Falerii. This later passage-way, even though it had four arches, must still have been called *Janus Geminus*, because this name was connected with the cult of Janus in that place and must, therefore, have become stereotyped. On account of the name, Procopius may have taken it for granted that the statue was a *bifrons*. He does not speak as though he had seen it himself. He simply says of it, *constat fuisse*. The conception of Janus as god of the seasons was associated with the four-arched passage and its *quadrifrons*.¹¹

The important thing in this connection is not to decide about the shape and final disposition of the statues, but to note that, in spite of the prominence of Janus in the worship of the Romans, and notwithstanding the analogy between the later literary character of Janus and a two-faced or four-faced figure, there were only two, or at most three statues of the god at Rome, so far as can be determined. Of these two were certainly not originally intended to represent Janus. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that Janus was not conceived by his worshipers as a human figure, but that the true image of him was the arch which was called by his name, the *Janus Geminus*.

¹¹ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 607.

CHAPTER V

THE CONNECTION OF JANUS WITH EARLY COINAGE

The lack of statues of Janus is the more remarkable in view of the fact that a representation of him as a two-faced deity must have been seen and handled often by the Romans, when they transacted business by means of the old *as*.¹ Since this head appears on the most ancient round coins of the Romans, it has been supposed² that this was the one true Italic representation of a deity, the only anthropomorphic divinity which the Romans developed independent of the influence of other nations. According to this theory, the image originated in the conception of Janus as a door-god. As a door serves as entrance and as exit, so the spirit of the door came to be represented as looking both ways at the same time; then, because a harbor is, in a certain sense, an entrance, the door-god came to be the presiding deity of harbors and of the commerce which came and went by way of the harbor; for this reason his head was represented on the first coins.³

But, since other nations worshiped two-faced divinities,⁴ it would seem more probable that the Romans had copied this, as they did other images of their gods. Another difficulty with the previous theory is that the two-faced Janus, so far as can be known, was represented nowhere except on these coins, and it seems hardly probable that the only native anthropomorphic deity should have had so restricted an existence. For, as has been said, of the three statues of Janus mentioned in literature, two were without doubt of foreign origin, and of the other nothing is known with certainty.⁵

It seems more reasonable, therefore, to suppose that the conception of a double face was a foreign one grafted on to Janus, just as happened in the case of the attributes of many other divinities; and

¹ Babelon *Monn. de la répub.* I, p. 21 sq.; Baumeister *Denk.* II, p. 964, no. 1158; p. 966, no. 1166; p. 967, no. 1175; Cohen *Monn. de emp.* II, p. 355-356, no. 881; III, p. 392, no. 17; *Monn. de la répub.* pl. XXIX; XLVI; XLVIII; LII; LIV sq; LXVII; Darem. & Saglio s. v. *Ianus* p. 610; Mommsen *Hist. de la monn. rom.* pl. V, 1; XVII, 5 & 6.

² Mommsen *Hist.* I, pp. 213-214; 225.

³ Cf. Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 105, for different view.

⁴ See *J.* p. 27; Overbeck *Kunstmyth* pp. 91, 92, 476, 478.

⁵ See *J.* Chapt. IV.

that the notion of a two-faced deity did not arise through analogy at all, but by a different process, which can be traced out with at least some degree of probability and may have been somewhat as follows: it has been seen that Janus held the first place in the list of gods, and that, when a prayer was made to the great divinities of the state, his name regularly came first. He usually received a preliminary offering even when a special sacrifice was made in honor of some other deity.⁶ The Romans held this custom very tenaciously, even after more attractive gods who were of foreign origin or who had developed under foreign influence had usurped the principal place in their worship. Janus must have gained this important place in the ritual because of this preëminence at the time when the religion was in the formative stage; so that when the ceremonial became stereotyped, he held this fixed position long after he ceased to satisfy the spiritual needs of the people. It has been seen that, because he was the special household god of the head of the family, Janus came to be invoked as an aid in many activities which were not originally under his jurisdiction.⁷ According to the theory first quoted, Janus was god of the door, and, because of the resemblance between a door and a harbor, he became god of harbors and was represented on coins. But it is difficult to imagine that these early Romans took a census of their divinities to discover which one presided over an activity most like that in which they were about to engage. It is most natural, on the other hand, to suppose that the worshipers of Janus turned spontaneously to the god who was uppermost in their minds. Having asked the assistance of Janus in their business affairs, they would soon identify him with the Greek god of trade, since they were very ready to consider their divinities the counterparts of foreign ones of like function. Now the Greeks occasionally represented some of their gods as two-faced. Hermes was often so fashioned. There even existed coins of this sort.⁸ When once the double-faced Hermes was presented to the Romans as corresponding to their Janus, the analogy between this symbol and the door-god

⁶ See *J.* Chapter III.

⁷ *J.* Chapt. I.

⁸ Athen. 15, 46; Darem. & Saglio 1, pp. 91-92; p. 419, fig. 508; Overbeck *Kunst-myth.* pp. 476 sqq.; Hill, *Coins of Sicily* p. 150; Ward *Greek Coins* pl. 8, fig. 308; *Catalogue Coins in Brit. Mus.* 1892, 1, p. 79; pp. 80, 82-84; 1873, 9 ff.; 1897 pp. 91 ff.; *J.* p. 28, note 4.

would undoubtedly help to fix the conception. The cult name Geminus, which Janus had received from his arch, would aid in establishing the idea.⁹ This cannot be proved with the certainty of a mathematical formula, but, in addition to the reasonableness of the theory, some facts may be adduced which add to its probability.

The coins bearing a Janus head often had on the reverse the representation of a ship's prow. These *asses* must have been at one time quite common, for Macrobius says that Roman boys in a game somewhat like "tossing pennies" called *capita aut navia*. This circumstance Macrobius takes to be a proof of the antiquity of this sort of coinage.¹⁰ Athenaeus says that Janus is represented on the *as* because it was he who invented the art of stamping money; and that the ship appears because he invented navigation.¹¹ Servius makes the ship a representation of the one in which Janus came to Italy.¹² Macrobius, on the other hand, thinks that it was Saturn who came over the sea, and that, being kindly received by Janus, who was king at that time, he rewarded the friendly monarch by teaching him and his subjects the arts of civilization. In gratitude for his practical education, Janus had Saturn's ship placed on the coins.¹³ Ovid gives much the same account, but says that it was pious posterity which preserved the memory of the ship by picturing it on coins.¹⁴ Plutarch asks the question, "How is it that they imagine Janus to have had two faces?" and, in reply to his own query, he conjectures, "Is it because he, being a Greek, came from Perrhaebia, as we learn from historians; and passing forward into Italy, dwelt in that country among the barbarous people who there lived, whose language and manner of life he changed? Or rather because he taught and persuaded them to live together after a civil and honest sort, in husbandry and tilling the ground, whereas formerly their manners were rude and their fashion savage without law or justice altogether."¹⁵ The two-faced Janus must have been a great puzzle to this inquirer, for he devotes to him another chapter also; "What is

⁹ *J.* p. 41.

¹⁰ Macro. 1, 7, 22.

¹¹ Athen. 15, 46.

¹² Serv. *Aen.* 8, 357.

¹³ Macro. 1, 7, 19-21.

¹⁴ Ov. *F.* 1, 239-240.

¹⁵ Plut. *Q. R.* 22.

the reason that the ancient coin and money in antiquity carried the stamp on one side of Janus with two faces? and on the other the prow or poop of a boat? Was it to honor Saturn who came to Italy in a ship? But Janus, Evander, and Aeneas came in ships. More likely because Janus instituted good government, civilized the Italians, and furnished necessities which were brought by sea and land. The two faces stand for the change of life that Janus brought in, and the boat stands for the river."¹⁶ Servius gives the bare explanation that Janus came as an exile in a ship, and on this account his head is stamped on one side of coins, and on the other a ship.¹⁷ Minucius Felix reverts to the story that Saturn fled from Crete to Italy and was received hospitably by Janus. Out of gratitude, since he was a Greek of culture, he taught the rude and uncivilized Italians many things, among them, to write, to coin money, and to make tools. Janus, therefore, named the country "Saturnia" and "Latium" in his honor.¹⁸ Plutarch, on the other hand, makes Janus himself teach these arts to the people, "For this Janus, in the most remote antiquity, whether a demi-god or a king, being remarkable for his political abilities, and his cultivation of society, reclaimed men from their rude and savage manners; he is therefore represented with two faces, as having altered the former state of the world, and given quite a new turn to life."¹⁹ Macrobius²⁰ says that religious rites and sacrifices were first established by Janus, and that his two faces, therefore, look towards the past and towards the future. Lydus expresses much the same idea.²¹

The gist of the passages may be put briefly as follows: Janus either on his own initiative, or under the influence of Saturn, introduced into Italy a knowledge of the arts of civilization, of religious rites and of coinage. The writers realized that this culture originated in Greece and came to Italy in a ship. Now, as is well known, the Romans had commercial relations with the Greeks in very early times, especially with those of Sicily.²² The truth, therefore, underlying these somewhat

¹⁶ Plut. *Q. R.* 41.

¹⁷ Serv. *Aen.* 8, 357.

¹⁸ Minuc. Felix 21, 5-6.

¹⁹ Plut. *Numa* 19.

²⁰ Macrobi. 1, 9, 2-4.

²¹ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 2.

²² Liv. 4, 25; 4, 52; Mommsen *Hist.* I, p. 231; pp. 258-259.

contradictory myths must be that when the Romans were still in the early stages of civilization, Greek traders came up the Tiber, bringing with them some knowledge of the arts of life and having as their patron a two-faced god. Since the appearance of the ships, of the coins, of the civilized arts, and of the god with the two faces was simultaneous, tradition linked them all together in these stories. In this connection it is interesting to note that Athenaeus says that Janus invented coinage and that on that account his head appears on many Greek and Sicilian coins.²³ He is evidently simply reversing the process, for it was these Greek and Sicilian coins which were the prototypes of the Roman, not the other way about. Athenaeus, although he must have been familiar with coins of this sort, made the same mistake that Augustus and Domitian did in identifying the symbol.²⁴

Although the Romans saw and handled constantly the coin having the double-faced head of Janus, yet, in spite of all the nice analogies to be noted between a door and such an image, and in spite of the prominence of the deity in worship, they were not moved to make other representations of him in this form. This is significant of the fact that the two-faced Janus was a god of coins only; that aside from these coins, he was not thought of in this shape. Therefore Ovid's statement that Janus had no Greek counterpart is true.²⁵ The identity of the Greek Hermes and of the Janus of the same form never occurred to the poet, partly, perhaps, because they were alike in so few particulars, and partly because the identification of Hermes with Mercury had obscured the early association of Hermes with Janus.

The Janus Portunus who was worshiped near the Tiber as a protector of grain, may be associated with the Janus of early commerce. Portunus is identified in Paulus-Festus with the Greek Palaemon.²⁶ Professor Fowler, arguing from an obscure passage in the Veronese Commentary on Vergil *Aeneid* 5, 241, comes to the conclusion that Portunus was not originally a god of harbors at all, but that he was guardian of the door to the granary in the Forum Boarium.²⁷ This bril-

²³ Athen. 15, 46; cf. *J. Chapt.* IV. See Carter *Relig. of Numa*; p. 77, 79; Hill *Handbook of Greek and Roman Coins* p. 45, for possible date of these Roman coins.

²⁴ *J. Chapt.* IV.

²⁵ *Ov. F.* 1, 90.

²⁶ *Fest.* 242, 243; Cf. *Verg. Aen.* 5, 241.

²⁷ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 202-204.

liant theory explains the keys that are assigned to him. It shows clearly, also, how he came to be an off-shoot of Janus: he was a localized form of the door-god. He became patron of harbors, probably, because his prototype Janus was a god of harbors and partly because the storehouse over which Portunus presided was near the Tiber. When grain was being transported up the Tiber in times of scarcity, the deity who guarded it in the storehouse probably extended his protection to it as it lay in the harbor close by. Thus he became protector of the boat-landing.

The festivals of Portunus and of Tiberinus fall on August 17th, which was the dedication day also of the temple of Janus built by Duilius.²⁸ The coincidence of the dates may be accidental. Mommsen, however, identifies Portunus with Tiberinus. In addition to the coincidence of the dates of the Portunalia and of the Tiberinalia, the fact that the two festivals were held in the same part of the city, near the Forum Boarium, may be considered as a support for this theory.²⁹ If, however, Professor Fowler's theory that Portunus was originally guardian of the *annona* be correct, these must have been distinct deities, for Tiberinus must surely have been primarily god of the Tiber. To make the matter still more difficult to untangle, there is yet another ancient deity, Voltumnus, who must also have been a river god. For the same name Voltumnus was applied to a river in Campania, and the Fasti Vallenses have a note under August 27, *Volturni flumini sacrificium*.³⁰ Varro says that the origin of Voltumnus was obscure, but that he had a flamen.³¹ This is about all the information which is to be had about the deity.³² Arnobius represents Janus as the father of Fons and the husband of Juturna, who was the daughter of Voltumnus.³³ The explanation of all this may possibly be as follows: In very ancient times, Voltumnus was the god of the river; but at this time the people were interested only in flocks and fields, and the god, consequently, was a power only to be feared because of his destructive floods. But, later, the commerce made possible by the navigable Tiber caused

²⁸ *CIL.* I, p. 399 (Aug. 17); Cf. *J.* p. 44.

²⁹ *CIL.* I, p. 399 (Aug. 17); 1, 407 (Dec. 8).

³⁰ *CIL.* I, p. 400. Cf. Paulus-Fest. 379.

³¹ Varro *L. L.* 7, 45. Cf. *ibid.* 6, 20.

³² See Mommsen's note in *CIL.* I, p. 400.

³³ Arnob. 3, 29.

that body of water to be propitiated from other motives than fear for the safety of crops and herds. At this time the name Tiberinus was given to the god, either because the river had now changed its name from Volturnus to Tiber or because the new function required a new god.

However this may be, it is at least reasonable to conjecture that at the time when Janus, the door-spirit, had become patron of shipping, Portunus, who was originally Janus Portunus, became guardian of the state granary. He developed into a harbor god, partly under the influence of Janus in that capacity, partly because the storehouse was near the river. Then Volturnus, the old god of the flowing river, was obscured by the divinity of the commercially valuable Tiber. Both Portunus and Tiberinus probably developed later than Volturnus. Professor Fowler suggests that the fact that the flamen of Tiberinus could be a plebeian may denote a late origin of the cult.³⁴ And C. Duilius probably dedicated a temple to Janus because at that time Janus was god of ships. The fact that he chose August 17 as the natal day of his temple may possibly show that he connected Janus with the gods of the river and of the harbor. In later times most of the old Roman gods were obscured by the Greek importations and Mercury became the god of commerce. But Janus held his position on the *as* as a reminiscence of his former importance in trade; Tiberinus and Portunus had a festival somewhere near the Tiber; while Volturnus had but the faintest traces left to him of his ancient worship. The Roman mythologists attempted to explain the confusion of deities exercising almost the same function by making them relatives.

³⁴ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* p. 202.

CHAPTER VI

JANUS GEMINUS AND OTHER JANUS-ARCHES AND TEMPLES

The true representation of Janus was no statue or image of any kind: it was the arch in the Forum called *Ianus Geminus*, the gates of which were opened in time of war and closed in time of peace.¹ This was the real Janus, the symbolical entrance-way, the *locus* of the cult of the door-way of the state, just as Vesta, in her little round temple, was the symbolical hearth of the city. The arch was the god himself, and it was nearly always called "Janus," not "temple of Janus," or "arch of Janus." The gates were the "gates of Janus," not the "gates of the arch of Janus."² The arch, at some time, contained a statue³ but Janus was not the image, or any spiritualization of it. The god was the door-way itself, and seldom was this called anything but "Janus." In this respect Janus retained his primitive character of *numen*. Vesta and Janus were the only great Roman deities that were not affected by Greek anthropomorphism. They kept their ancient animistic character almost unchanged throughout the whole period of Roman religion.

The cult of the *Ianus Geminus* originated in a period so remote that it is only by careful analysis that a faint conception of the conditions can be gained. It is quite generally conceded that the Roman state worship was but the counterpart of that of the family. As the father was the religious head of the household,⁴ so the early king was the chief of the religion of the community. The king's hearth was the central fireplace, his daughters tended the fire. In historical times the Vestal virgins took the place of the king's daughters, and the temple of Vesta became the hearth of the city.⁵ If the parallelism had been complete, it would be expected that the state door-way would be the entrance to the king's palace. This dwelling of the king was later

¹ Hor. *Sat.* 1, 4, 60-61; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610; Suidas *s. v.*; Verg. *Aen.* 1, 293-296; J. Chapt. IV. cf. Liv. 1, 19.

² See references cited in this Chapter. Note the awkward personification in Stat. *Silv.* 4, 1, 11-44.

³ J. Chapt. IV.

⁴ Cato *R. R.* 143.

⁵ Bailey *Relig. of Ancient Rome* pp. 75 ff.; Carter *Relig. of Numa* pp. 12-15; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 283, 288, 335; Cf. Dion. of Hal. 2, 14; J. pp. 45 sq.

represented by the Regia.⁶ To complete the analogy, then, the state Janus should have been the door to this Regia. How, instead of this, the symbolical entrance came to be an independent building, an anomaly, a door-way leading to no edifice, remains an insoluble mystery. Varro identifies the Janus-arch with the *Porta Ianualis*, which, he says was the third of the gates leading to the Palatine city.⁷ If his assumption were correct, the *Ianus Geminus* would be the survival, not of the king's door-way, but of a city gate; and Janus would have been the patron of gates, as well as of doors. In this case, the cult must have become localized at the *Porta Ianualis*, which was preserved, on account of religious conservatism, long after the city had outgrown the wall to which it had served as an opening. It is possible that the cult of *Ianus Geminus* originated in some such way as this. It seems strange, however, if Janus ever were protector of the city gates, that he did not continue in that office, since Rome was continually beset by enemies, and always had ample need of protection at her gates. One would expect the cult to move out along with the new gates of each successive wall; for had such a practice ever existed, there was never a sufficient interval of peace, during the stormy period of the city's growth to allow her to forget the ceremony. Consequently, it seems hardly possible that any rites were ever performed at the city gates. Furthermore, Plutarch expressly states that the city gates were not sacred to any god.⁸ In historical times, at all events, the Romans remained satisfied with the protection of Janus at the one symbolical gate. Moreover, Macrobius seems to consider the *Porta Ianualis* and the Janus-arch as two distinct buildings, since he says that in the Sabine war, Rome's enemies were overwhelmed by water which burst *ex aede Iani per hanc portam*.⁹ Probably the origin of the arch was obscured by antiquity as deeply for Varro and Macrobius as it is for modern scholars. If there ever was a *Porta Ianualis*, its existence might even be taken as slight evidence for the supposition that Janus was not a god of gates. For, if all gates were sacred to him, it is hardly likely that his name would have been attached to only one. This is, however, merely conjectural, and is worth no more than similar guesses of the Roman etymologists.

⁶ *J.* p. 45-46.

⁷ Varro *L. L.* 5, 165; Cf. Platner, p. 191, note 10.

⁸ Plut. *Q. R.* 27.

⁹ Macrobi. 1, 9, 17-18.

One thing only is certain, whatever the origin of the arch may have been, that it represented a passageway, and that it was Janus himself. The cult, moreover, was so deeply rooted as to be one of the last traces of Paganism to be abandoned. In the time of Belisarius, about two centuries after Christianity became the state religion, at the beginning of the war with the Goths, some persons at Rome opened the doors of the old *Ianus Geminus*.¹⁰ So deeply rooted was the feeling that no war could be begun properly without this ancient ceremony.

In the tempestuous history of Rome, there were but few periods during which the "gates of war" were closed. Tradition says that Numa, the advocate of peace, founded the arch, and that during the forty-three years of his reign, the gates remained shut.¹¹ After that they were open constantly until after the first Punic war. Then came a short interval of peace.¹² Again for over two hundred years there was strife, until the time of Augustus. He closed the gates at least three times, perhaps four.¹³ One of these periods of tranquility included the date traditionally assigned to the birth of Christ, a fact that deeply impressed the minds of the early Christians.¹⁴

The gates were closed again during the reign of Nero,¹⁵ under Ves-pasian,¹⁶ perhaps under Domitian,¹⁷ during the joint reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus,¹⁸ under Constantine,¹⁹ and under Honorius.²⁰

¹⁰ Procop. *Bel. Goth.* 1, 25. (Teubner ed.)

¹¹ S. Aug. *C. D.* 3, 9; 3, 10; Flor. *Epit.* 1, 18, 1; Liv. 1, 19; Plut. *Fortuna Rom.* 9; Numa 20; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 291; 1, 294; Varro *L. L.* 5, 165; Vell. Pater. 2, 38, 3; Aur. Vict. *Vir. Ill.* 79; Mommsen *Res Gestae Divi Aug.* p. 50.

¹² Note 11 above. Servius, however, in *Aen.* 1, 291, makes the misstatement that the temple was closed after the Second Punic war, but Varro and others unite in saying that it was after the First.

¹³ *CIL.* I, p. 312; p. 384, Mommsen's note on Jan. 11; Dio Cass. 51, 20; 53, 26; 54, 36 (On this occasion the gates were not closed, on account of a revolt of the Dacians.); Hor. *Od.* 4, 15, 8-9; *Epist.* 2, 1, 253-255; Liv. 1, 19; *Mon. Ancyr.* cap. 13, pp. L-LI; pp. 49 ff. (Mommsen's ed.); Oros. 1, 1; 6, 20; 6, 21; 6, 22; 7, 3; Ov. *F.* 1, 282; Plut. *Fortuna Rom.* 9; Numa 20; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 291; Suet. *Aug.* 22; Vell. Pater. 2, 38, 3; Aur. Vict. *Vir. Ill.* 79; William Fairley *Trans. and Reprints, Mon. Ancyr.* pp. 36-37.

¹⁴ Oros. 1, 1; 6, 22; 7, 3; 7, 9; Cf. Milton *Hymn to the Nativity*.

¹⁵ Lucan. *Phars.* 1, 61-62; Suet. *Nero* 14; see also note 23, p. 40.

¹⁶ Oros. 7, 3; 7, 9; 7, 20.

¹⁷ Stat. *Silv.* 4, 1.

¹⁸ Lamprid. *Vit. Comm.* 16; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 27.

¹⁹ Amm. Marc. 16, 10, 1.

²⁰ Claudian *XXII Laud. Stilich.* 2, 286-287; *XXVIII VI Cos. Hon.* 637-641.

It is said that they were opened during Gordian's reign,²¹ therefore it is safe to assume that they had been closed previously. There is no mention of any other opening or closing of the arch, except the one lapse into pagan practice at the beginning of the war with the Goths.²² This is the last account of the ceremony.

There are no remains identified as belonging to the *Ianus Geminus*. It is fairly certain, however, that it was situated in the northeast end of the Forum, near the entrance to the Argiletum.²³ Originally it had two openings. It is probably due to this fact, not to any character of the deity, that Janus was called Geminus.²⁴ There is a representation of the structure on coins of Nero,²⁵ from which it appears to have been a small building, barely large enough to accommodate a pair of double doors with heavy bolts. The description by Procopius corresponds to the picture on the coin, but does not agree with M^artil, or with Servius, according to whom, Domitian, when he rebuilt and enlarged the arch, changed it from a *bifrons* to a *quadrifrons*, in order to make the openings correspond to the four faces of the Falerian statue which he intended to set up in it.²⁶ A possible explanation is, that by the time of Procopius the structure had been changed again to a two-arched passage; or, that the author of *de Bello Gothico* was misled by the epithet *Geminus*. He described the statue, however, as a *quadrifrons*. Probably he never saw the building.²⁷ In addition, some of the incon-

²¹ Jul Capit. *Vit. Gord.* 26; Eutrop. 9, 2; Oros. 7, 19.

²² Procop. *Bell. Goth.* 1, 25; *J. p.* 28.

²³ *CIL*. I, p. 395, *June* 9; Liv. 1, 19; Ov. *F.* 1, 258 (but cf. Platner p. 191); *Met.* 14, 785-786; Procop. *Bell. Goth.* 1, 25; Ser^a. *Aen.* 7, 607 (Servius says, SVNT GEMINAE BELLI PORTAE Sacrum hoc, id est, belli portas Numa Pompilius fecerat circum imum Argiletum iuxta theatrum Marcelli. Quod fuit in duobus brevissimis templis: duobus autem propter Ianum bifrontem. . . . That the arch was *iuxta theatrum Marcelli* is clearly impossible. He has evidently confused the *Ianus Geminus* with the temple of Duilius, See *J.* p. 44.); Gilbert *Geschichte u. Top. der Stadt Rom* 1, p. 321; Huelsen *Rom. For.* pp. 134 sqq. (Carter's trans.); Platner pp. 190 ff.

²⁴ *J.* p. 29.

²⁵ Baumeister *Denk.* 1, p. 234, fig. 206; Cohen *Monn. de l'imp.* 1, p. 287, 114; p. 289, 141.

²⁶ Mart. 10, 28; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 607; *J.* Chapt. IV.

²⁷ *J.* p. 29; Cf. Plut. *Fortuna Rom.* 9; Numa 20; Stat. *Silv.* 4, 1, 13-14; Verg. *Aen.* 1, 294; 7, 610. According to Platner (p. 268), Domitian did not rebuild the old Janus Geminus, but set up an additional one in the Forum of Nerva. Cf. *J.* Chapt. IV.

sistencies in descriptions of form and situation may be due to the rebuildings of the arch; for the Janus must have been rebuilt several times, as were the other buildings in the Forum.

To the ceremonies attending the opening and closing of the "gates of war and peace" there are but few references, and these must be pieced together in order to make any complete picture. Vergil and his commentator, Servius, say that the consul, when opening the gates, wore the *trabea* of Quirinus.²⁸ Macrobius connects the two epithets of Janus, *Patulcius* and *Clusius*, with the opening and closing of the doors.²⁹ Ovid says that these names were used at the time when the priest offered up a cake of meal and salt.³⁰ In Paulus-Festus mention is made of the cake *Ianual* which was offered only to Janus.³¹ Cato tells of an offering of *strues*,³² a word which, in Paulus-Festus is described as consisting of strips of bread laid crosswise, one above the other.³³ It is possible that *Ianual* and *strues* were different names for the same thing, and that the *strues* mentioned in Paulus-Festus was the same as that offered to Janus in the ritual described by Cato: in that case they were the offering made in the field. As to any other place of offering, nothing is said in these passages. But Macrobius quotes Varro for the statement that there existed twelve altars to Janus, a number corresponding to the number of months in a year.³⁴ If these twelve altars really existed, they were set up at a late period, for, as has been shown, it was not until 153 B.C. that the month of Janus became the first of the year, and that Janus became, by a figure of speech, a leader of time.³⁵ The erecting of these altars would correspond, perhaps, to the placing of the figures CCCLXV on the fingers of the statue in the arch.³⁶ It is certain that these numerals were a late invention, because the Romans did not have a year of 365 days until 45 B.C.³⁷ All that can be said, then, with certainty about the ceremonies in honor of Janus is that his gates were opened

²⁸ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610; Verg. *Aen.* 7, 607-614.

²⁹ Macrobius 1, 9, 16; Cf. Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1.

³⁰ Ov. *F.* 1, 127-130.

³¹ Paulus-Festus 104.

³² Cato *R. R.* 134.

³³ Paulus-Festus 310.

³⁴ Macrobius 1, 9, 16.

³⁵ *J.* Chapt. III, p. 28 sq.

³⁶ *J.* Chapt. IV, note 10, p. 28.

³⁷ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* p. 4; *J.* Chapt. IV.

by a consul attired in an ancient religious garb; that a cake called *Ianua* and one called *strues* were offered to Janus; that at the offering of some cakes, whether of these or of others, the god was addressed as *Patulcius* and *Clusius*; that these names were connected in some way with the opening and closing of the arch; that in the last years of the republic, or in the first of the empire, twelve altars were erected to Janus, and the figures CCCLXV were placed on the fingers of his statue.

In time of peace, when of course, the Janus-arch was closed, an *augurium salutis* was taken by the new consul.³⁸ The fact that Augustus performed this long-neglected ceremony, when he closed the gates of Janus, does not necessarily indicate any other connection between the *augurium* and Janus beyond the fact that both were concerned with peace.³⁹

The part of the Forum in which bankers, money-lenders and lawyers had their places of business, was often called *ad Ianum*, or *ad Ianum medium*. Cicero so uses the expression in *De Officiis* 2, 87: De collocanda pecunia commodius a quibusdam optimis viris ad Ianum medium sedentibus disputatur and in *Philippic* 6, 5, 15: L. Antonio a Iano medio Patrono. Itane? quis umquam in illo Iano inventus est qui L. Antonio mille nummum ferret expensum? and Horace in *Satires*, 2, 3, 18-20:

. . . . Postquam omnis res mea Ianum
ad medium fracta est; aliena negotia curo,
excussus propriis.

In Ovid, *Remedia Amoris* 561;

Qui Puteal Ianumque timet, celeresque Kalendas,

the same region is meant, but is called *Ianus*, not *Ianus medius*, and includes the Puteal. In Horace *Satire* 2, 6, 20-23, the Puteal is mentioned alone as a meeting-place of lawyers and of business men. These passages seem to show that "Janus" was a portion of the Forum, of indefinite area, in which business was transacted. In Horace, *Epistles*, 1, 20, 1-2, Janus and Vortumnus are given as objects which will be seen by a book ambitious for public notice.⁴⁰ For an interpretation

³⁸ Dio Cass. 37, 24.

³⁹ Dio Cass. 51, 20; Suet. *Aug.* 31; Bailey *Rom. Relig.* p. 98. Cf. Cic. *Div.* 1, 105; Paulus-Fest. 161; *J.* p. 39.

⁴⁰ Cf. Cic. *Verr.* 1, 154, and Asconius' note; Liv. 44, 16; Prop. 4, 2; Varro *L. L.* 5, 46.

of this passage, it is not necessary to assume that a statue of Vortumnus and a Janus-arch stood near the shop of the Sosii, where the book would be exposed for sale. It is more probable that the poet is merely calling attention to two prominent things which may be seen by the book from the shop, or when purchased and carried off through the Forum.⁴¹

Horace, *Epistles* 1, 1, 53-54:

. quaerenda pecunia primum est,
 Haec Janus summus ab imo
 prodocet,

in conjunction with the passages in which *Janus medius* is mentioned, has been taken as evidence that there were three Janus arches in the Forum, *Ianus Medius*, *Janus Summus* and *Janus Imus*.⁴² The lines above would then mean, "From the upper to the lower Janus-arch this is taught." Bentley arguing from the fact that the words *summus*, *imus* and *medius* are often used of an inclined street, concluded that *ad Ianum* was the name of a street.⁴³ It is more probable, however, that *ad Ianum* means simply an indefinite portion of the Forum. In that case, *ad Ianum medium* is "in the middle" of this area or "near the Janus-arch which stands in the middle of the Forum,"⁴⁴ and *Ianus summus ab imo* means "from one end to the other of the business section of the Forum."⁴⁵

There were other arches called *Iani*, but none had the sanctity of the *Janus Geminus*.⁴⁶ There was one, probably, at the foot of the Janiculum;⁴⁷ another, a *bifrons*, which still stands in the Velabrum, was built by the silversmiths in honor of Septimius Severus, his wife and two sons; near this is a *quadrifrons*, the date of which is uncertain.⁴⁸ The *Tigillum Sororum* is sometimes given in the list of Janus-arches. It is doubtful whether however, this was a Janus.⁴⁹ The *Janus Quadri-*

⁴¹ Huelsen *For. Rom.* p. 65 ff.

⁴² Gilbert *Geschichte und Top. der Stadt Rom* 3, pp. 215 sqq.

⁴³ Bentley on Hor. *Epist.* 1, 1, 54; So also Richter *Top.* p. 106 ff.; Lanciani *Ruins* p. 251 sqq; *Bull. della Commissione Archeologica Comunale di Roma* 1890, 100.

⁴⁴ Jordan 1, 2, 213 sqq.

⁴⁵ Platner p. 257.

⁴⁶ Cic. *N. D.* 2, 27, 67; Liv. 41, 27; 2, 49; Ov. *F.* 1, 257; Suet. *Aug.* 31.

⁴⁷ Darem. and Saglio s. v. *Ianus*; Roscher *Lex.* col. 22.

⁴⁸ Jordan 1, 2, pp. 471 sq.; Platner p. 403.

⁴⁹ *J.* Chapt. IX.

frons built by Domitian in the Forum Transitorium, or Forum Nervae, is sometimes counted as another Janus-arch, but, as has been shown, this may have been only a rebuilding of the old *Janus Geminus*.⁵⁰ Augustus may have built a new arch to shelter the statue which he brought from Egypt, but here also there is uncertainty as to whether the reference is to a new arch or to the old *Janus Geminus*.⁵¹

These *Iani*, as well as the triumphal arches which are not generally so designated, constitute, one of the original contributions of the Romans to the architecture of the world. It is to be seen, however, that they were the result, not of a sudden inspiration, but of a strange dissociation of the door, Janus, from the building to which it had, at one time, been an entrance.

The only true temple that Janus ever had was the one near the *Porta Carmentalis*,⁵² built by C. Duilius in fulfillment of a vow.⁵³ This site was called, but obviously not until the time of Augustus, *ad Theatrum Marcelli*. On August 17 and on October 18 offerings were made there.⁵⁴ These dates mark respectively the natal day of the temple and the date of its restoration. The fact that Duilius vowed a temple to Janus shows that the god of doors was a war god, and was important to warriors even as late as the Punic wars. The fact that the dedication day of this temple was made to coincide with the festivals of Tiberinus and Portunus cannot be taken as proof of the association of Janus with these two deities. As has been said, the coincidence of the dates of the two festivals may have been purely accidental.⁵⁵

⁵⁰ *J.* Chapt. IV.

⁵¹ *J.* Chapt. IV, p. 27.

⁵² Liv. 2, 49, 8; Paulus-Fest. 285.

⁵³ Tacit. *Ann.* 2, 49.

⁵⁴ *CIL.* 1, p. 320; 399. Aust *Aedibus Sacris* p. 18; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 202 sqq.

⁵⁵ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 204 ff.; *J.* p. 34.

CHAPTER VII

THE REX SACRORUM

Mention has been made of the theory that the primitive worship of the Roman state was the counterpart of that of the household. In accordance with this hypothesis, the king was the religious head of the community, performing for the state the office which the father performed for his household; the king's daughters who attended the state's Vesta, filled, in the state, the place of the daughters in a family; and the entrance to the king's dwelling must have been the seat of the Janus of the city¹.

As late as republican days there were found remnants of this parallelism. A *rex sacrorum* performed for the state some of the duties of the ancient king; Vestal virgins cared for the sacred fire; the *Janus Geminus* in the Forum was the symbolical door-way of the state. The natural inference is that the *rex sacrorum* was the priest of this public Janus, as the father of each household was priest of his own domestic Janus. This is the usual explanation of the "king of sacred things."² It must be confessed that the parallelism is very attractive. It can hardly be expected, however, that a state religion, though in the beginning it may have been an exact reproduction of domestic worship, would continue to furnish a perfect counterpart when, in the growing complexity of civilization, the commonwealth developed many phases of activity not found in the household. For this reason, some discrepancies are to be observed in the comparison. One of these has been noted, that originally Janus must have resided in the entrance to the king's palace. In the Republic, the Regia was the survival of this royal dwelling. It was the seat of the state religion of an earlier epoch. Its sacred character is shown by the sacrifices performed there, by the wreaths placed above its door, and by the religious articles kept in its *sacraria*,³ but, in spite of this, it was not the door of the Regia, but

¹ *J.* pp. 1-2; 37-38.

² Bailey *Relig. of Ancient Rome* p. 77; Carter *Relig. of Numa* p. 13; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 334-335; *Relig. Experience of the Rom. People* pp. 126 ff.; Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.*, pp. 509 ff.

³ Dion. of Hal. 2, 70; Gell. 4, 6, 1; Macrob. 1, 12, 6; 1, 15, 19; Ov. *F.* 3, 135-144; Fest. 186; 278; 279; Plut. *Numa* 14, 15; *Rom.* 29; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 603; 8, 363; Varro *L. L.* 6, 21; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 35-36, 39, 44, 213, 324; cf. Ov. *Trist.* 3, 1, 30; Solin. 1, 21; Tacit. *Ann.* 15, 41; *J.* p. 62.

an entirely distinct edifice, the *Janus Geminus*, which was the symbolical state door, the Janus of the whole Republic.⁴

Another disagreement between the republican, and the primitive organization, one that more nearly concerns this Chapter, is the fact that, although the Vestals took the place of the king's daughters, yet the *rex sacrorum*, the survival of the primitive king, was not their official father; for it was the *pontifex maximus*, a person not found at all in the primitive order of things, who held these maidens under his *potestas*.⁵ Whether the usual explanation of the origin of the Vestals be true or not, the fact remains that the high priest surpassed in power, and even inaugurated the *rex*;⁶ and this fact requires explanation. The ancient Romans knew that their *rex sacrorum* was a survival of the king in his religious capacity. To account, then, for his meager authority even in matters of worship, they said that, because of the tyranny of the Tarquins, the very name of king was hated and feared, and that therefore the most important religious duties of the chief were given to the *pontifex maximus*, in order that the power of the one bearing the royal title might be as slight as possible.⁷ But if these early Romans were capable of abolishing or curtailing old offices and creating new ones in so violent a fashion, it seems strange that they should have felt constrained to retain their *rex* at all. If, on the other hand, belief in their religious conservatism is to be upheld, a more reasonable explanation would be that these offices were the result of a gradual growth. A clue to the solution of the problem may be found by an inquiry into the nature of the early kingship.

Reference has been made to the evidence collected by Professor Frazer showing that the kings of many primitive nations, both of the past and of the present, have been considered by their subjects to be the incarnations of deities.⁸ It seems likely that, at a similar stage of their development, the Romans had kings of the same sort. This supposition is strengthened by the established fact that such kings existed near

⁴ *J.* Chapt. VI.

⁵ Fest. 106; Plut. *Numa* 9; Ov. *F.* 3, 419-428.

⁶ Fest. 126; Liv. 2, 2; 40, 42, 8-9; Wissowa, 509 sqq.

⁷ Dion. of Hal. 4, 73-74; 5, 1; Liv. 2, 1-2; Lyd. *Magist. Reip. Rom.* 1, 36; Plut. *Q. R.* 63.

⁸ Frazer *Golden Bough, The Dying God; The Magic Art; Lectures on the Early Hist. of the Kingship*; see especially *Magic Art*, pt. 2, pp. 174 sqq.; *J.* p. 1-2.

Rome. The strange priest-king at Nemi was, as Professor Frazer has shown, a survival of such an incarnate ruler.⁹

Moreover the traditions current among the Romans about the deification of Romulus¹⁰ prove that the idea of a king-god was not repugnant to them; and the ease with which the cult of the deified emperors was established was due, not to the arrogance and the power of these rulers themselves, but to the fact that the germ of this sort of worship had always lain dormant in the hearts of the people, ready to grow under favorable circumstances. It is a significant fact that both Julius Caesar and Augustus were considered deities even during their lifetime.¹¹ Ideas of this kind could not have sprung up out of nothing in a short time. They must have been a natural development of the king-worship which had lain dormant for centuries in the religious concepts of the people. From the time of Julius Caesar on, the worship of the emperors was a regular part of the Roman religion. The deity with whom the emperor was usually identified was Jupiter.¹²

The existence at Rome of a divine kingship is suggested also by the *Regifugium*.¹³ This was a ceremony occurring on the twenty-fourth of February, when the *rex sacrorum* performed a sacrifice in the Comitium early in the morning and immediately fled in haste. The Romans seem to have thought that this speedy departure was emblematic of the flight of the Tarquins from Rome. This is too obviously a theory made up to fit the name. By the same sort of etymological reasoning, the *Poplifugium* was said to commemorate the flight of the people after a battle.¹⁴ The true reason for the flight of the king must lie deeper in

⁹ Valer. Flacc. *Argon.* 2, 300-305; Ov. *Ars Am.* 1, 259-260; *F* 3, 271-272; Pausan. 2, 27, 4; Serv. *Aen.* 6, 136; Stat. *Silv.* 3, 1, 55-56; Strabo 5, 3, 12; Suet. *Calig.* 35; Frazer *Golden Bough, The Magic Art*, pp. 1-24; *J.* pp. 2 sqq.

¹⁰ S. Aug. *C. D.* 3, 15; Cic. *Nat. Deor.* 2, 24, 62; *Rep.* 2, 10, 17-18; Dion. of Hal. 2, 56; 2, 63; Flor. *Epit.* 1, 1, 18; Liv. 1, 16; Ov. *F.* 2, 491-512; *Met.* 14, 805-828; Plut. *Numa* 2; *Rom.* 28, 29; Aur. Vict. *Vir. Ill.* 2.

¹¹ Appian. *Bell. Civ.* 2, 148; 3, 2; Dio Cass. 44, 5-7; 44, 51; 51, 19-20; Hor. *Od.* 1, 2, 41-52; Ov. *Met.* 15, 745-870; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 290; 1, 291; Suet. *Aug.* 94-100; *Jul.* 76; 88; Verg. *Aen.* 1, 289-290; (many other references might be added).

¹² *J.* pp. 51-54.

¹³ Auson. *Eclog.* 385, 13-14; *CIL.* I, p. 387, *Feb.* 24, and Mommsen's note; Ov. *F.* 2, 685-852; 5, 727-728; Fest. 278, 279; Plut. *Q. R.* 63; Serv. *Aen.* 8, 646; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 327-331; Mommsen in *CIL.* I, p. 367, 1, 3.

¹⁴ Macrob. 3, 2, 14; Varro *L. L.* 6, 18; See Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 174 ff.

the nature of religious sacrifices. Professor Robertson Smith, from data too copious to be presented here, deduces the law that the victim slain in honor of a god was always originally that deity himself.¹⁵ If this is true, the animal killed at the *Regifugium* represented some divinity. But why did the *rex* himself flee so swiftly after the sacrifice? Was it because it was a sacrilege to slay a god? If this were so, why did not all priests run away after performing similar rites? Is it not really much more probable that, although this victim, in accordance with Professor Smith's law, was a deity, yet it was not from the consequences of the sacrilegious slaughter that the priest-king fled; but that the *rex sacrorum*, like the primitive kings already mentioned, was himself originally both the deity and the victim, "a god self-slain on his own strange altar?" He, then, felt a particular necessity for flight, if he would avoid an untimely death. Perhaps some crafty old king, on perceiving that the time was come when he must pay for the privileges enjoyed during his reign, repaired in secret to the place set for his very literal self-sacrifice, slew a sheep and fled, leaving it on the altar as a substitute for himself. It must have been comparatively easy to persuade his superstitious subjects that the gods had accepted the animal, or even that they had provided it themselves. Having once found that no ill consequences followed the sacrifice of a beast instead of a man, a people that was so far advanced in civilization as to be averse to the slaughter of an innocent human being, would be likely to continue the vicarious sacrifice. When once the *rex* had slain his victim and fled, he would always perform the act in the same way. And, in more cultivated times, the *rex sacrorum* fled in imitation of that fear which had inspired the flight of the primitive king.¹⁶

The next question to consider is: what god was incarnated in this priest-king? In the examples given by Professor Frazer, the kings who attained this unenviable god-head were always magicians who had power especially over the weather.¹⁷ The reason for slaying this king, as has been shown in another connection,¹⁸ was to keep his power un-

¹⁵ Encyclop. Brit. article "Sacrifice."

¹⁶ For other instances of flights in primitive rituals, see; Farnell *Cults of the Greek States*, 1, pp. 88; Frazer *Golden Bough* 2, pp. 35 sqq.; Lobek *Aglaophamus* 676; Mannhardt *Myth. Forsch.* pp. 58 sqq.; Robertson Smith *Relig. of the Semites*, pp. 286 sqq.

¹⁷ Frazer *Golden Bough*, Chapters 1, 2 & 6; *Lect. on the Early Hist. of the Kingship*.

¹⁸ *J.* p. 2.

harmed by advancing age, or, in time of scarcity, to influence the weather and secure more abundant crops. Now, the Roman god of the sky and of the rain was, of course, Jupiter.¹⁹ Therefore it seems entirely probable that the early king, the descendant of the rain-making magician, was a human Jupiter. If so, this god Jupiter, conversely, had been an earthly ruler who was etherialized into a real divinity, whereas the king, who originally had been the god himself, became merely vice-regent on earth. Perhaps some of the stories associated with the priestly Numa may be reminiscences of the magical relation between him and the weather god. One such tale is the following: The pious monarch, by the recitation of a certain formula, brought Jupiter down from the sky. He then inquired of the Thunderer what propitiatory offering he desired when he hurled his bolts against mankind. "A head must be cut off," said the god; "Of an onion," Numa agrees. "Of a man," the deity insists; "The topmost hairs," retorts the king. Jupiter repeats his demand, "A life must be sacrificed," "Yes, of a fish," assents the ever-compliant Numa. Seeing the uselessness of continuing the argument with so clever a controversialist, Jupiter yielded, and from that time on, the sacrifices suggested by Numa were made for lightning.²⁰ Besides showing the magical relationship between Numa and the god of thunder, this story incidentally gives another example of a human sacrifice being changed to that of an animal, or even a vegetable.²¹ Furthermore, according to Plutarch, Numa instituted and took part in certain "sacrifices and dances," in order to secure the aid of the gods.²² These ceremonies were probably magical practices, somewhat like the dances of the "medicine men" among the American Indians.

King Latinus became *Jupiter Latiaris* after his death,²³ and Aeneas was deified as *Jupiter Indiges*.²⁴ This enhances the probability that these kings were Jupiters during their lifetime. To *Jupiter Latiaris*,

¹⁹ Carter *Relig. of Numa*, pp. 21 & 58; Cook, A. B. *Zeus*, pp. 10 sqq.; pp. 41, sqq.; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 88 sqq.; 229 sqq.; Frazer *Golden Bough, The Magic Art* 2, pp. 174 sqq.; Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.*, pp. 113 sqq.

²⁰ Arnob. 5, 1-4; Ov. *F.* 3, 327-369; Plin. *N. H.* 2, 53, 140; Plut. *Numa* 15; Aur. *Vict. Vir. Ill.* 4.

²¹ Cf. Fest. 379, where the *ver sacrum* is mentioned.

²² Plut. *Numa* 8.

²³ Fest. 194; Frazer *Golden Bough*, 2, 187.

²⁴ Liv. 1, 2, 6; Ov. *Met.* 14, 581-608; Serv. *Aen.* 1, 259; cf. 4, 620.

moreover, human sacrifices were offered,²⁵ a circumstance suggesting still further a connection between him and divine victims of primitive times, such as the *Rex Nemorensis*. The many taboos²⁶ that had to be observed by the *rex sacrorum* and by the *flamen Dialis*, appear by a comparison with such things among other primitive nations to be an indication of divinity.²⁷ Their purpose seems to have been to protect the godhead, because any injury coming to him would affect the whole country. Furthermore, a passage from Plautus²⁸ quoted and translated by Professor Frazer,²⁹ shows that the idea of human Jupiters was sufficiently familiar to the Romans to be used in a popular play. An old man says to a slave, "I'll be your Jupiter; and, so long as I am propitious, you need not care a straw for these lesser gods." "That's all nonsense," retorts the slave, "as if you did not know how human Jupiters die a sudden death. When you are a dead Jupiter, and your kingdom has passed to others, who will there be to protect me?" This may, of course, be borrowed from the Greeks, from whom Plautus drew most of his material; but he would hardly have used it unless there had been something in Roman customs, or traditions, enough like it to make it intelligible to his audience. It is entirely reasonable to suppose that the reference is to a ceremony at some near place, such as Nemi, or that it is a conception native to Rome. But even if the idea be an imported one, it must be noticed that it is Jupiter, not some other deity, who is chosen as the god who could die.

It is to be noted, too, that the title *Rex* is constantly bestowed on Jupiter.³⁰ It is possible, to be sure, that this may be another case of borrowing from the Greeks. The Romans may simply have identified their Jupiter with the Greek Zeus; but even if this were so, the fact that he, rather than some other god, was chosen as the counterpart of the Homeric "king of gods and men," is some indication of his original character of king. The consistency with which this title is bestowed

²⁵ Min. Felix 22, 6; 30, 4; Liv. 10, 38; Tert. *Apol.* 9.

²⁶ Fest. 81; 248-249; Gell. 10, 15; Plin. *N. H.* 18, 12, 30, 119; 28, 9, 40, 146; Plut. *Q. R.* 40, 44; 50; 109-113.

²⁷ Frazer *Golden Bough, Taboo, and the Perils of the Soul; Lect. on the Early Hist. of the Kingship*, Chapt. 2.

²⁸ Plaut. *Casina* 2, 5, 23-29 (330-337).

²⁹ Frazer *Lect. on the Early Hist. of the Kingship*, pp. 282-283.

³⁰ S. Aug. *C. D.* 4, 17; 4, 23; 7, 9; 7, 11; Hor. *Od.* 4, 4, 2; Verg. *Aen.* 1, 65; 2, 648; 5, 533; 10, 2.

on Jupiter, *quem unum omnium deorum et hominum regem esse omnes doctrina expoliti consentiunt*,³¹ adds to its significance in the present discussion. A line of Horace may be added to this,

*reges in ipsos imperium est Iovis.*³²

Any other of the gods might equally well have been considered the ruler over kings, were it not for the fact that Jupiter was himself *rex*. There is, too, a constant association of Jupiter with kings. He it was who ratified the election of Numa to the kingship.³³ An eagle, the bird of Jove, foretold to Tarquinius Priscus that he should sit on a throne.³⁴ And when a similar aquiline messenger of the gods swooped down and carried off Lucumo's cap, he realized that a like honor was in store for him.³⁵ It is true that Romulus, after his apotheosis, gained the name Quirinus, not Jupiter, but at any rate, Jupiter had his share in the deification of this first king of Rome, for he took him to heaven during a thunderstorm.³⁶ Livy says that Jupiter, Romulus and the kings all bore the same name.³⁷ This may indeed be only the title *rex*, nevertheless the statement connects the kings with Jupiter. Servius, reversing the order, says that ancient kings often assumed the names of gods.³⁸ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in explaining the reason for the establishing of a *rex sacrorum*, says that he was appointed on the expulsion of the kings because the name of the royal power came from the gods and therefore could not be abolished.³⁹ Finally, it was Jupiter who was constantly associated with the emperors.⁴⁰ Ovid sees the oak wreath over the door of the house of Augustus, and wonders whether it be the temple of Jupiter which he beholds; then, later on, he unblushingly addresses that emperor as *maxime dive*.⁴¹ Horace invokes Jupiter as the guardian of Augustus and implies that the emperor is the vice-

³¹ Cic. *Rep.* 1, 36, 56.

³² Hor. *Od.* 3, 1, 6.

³³ Liv. 1, 18, 9-10.

³⁴ Aur. Vict. *Vir. Ill.* 6.

³⁵ Liv. 1, 34, 8-9.

³⁶ Cf. Cook *Class. Rev.* 18, pp. 360 sqq.

³⁷ Liv. 3, 39, 4.

³⁸ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 180.

³⁹ Dion. of Hal. 4, 73-74.

⁴⁰ Dio Cass. 43, 14; 53, 16; Ov. *F.* 1, 612-614; *Mel.* 1, 562; Suet. *Aug.* 94-100; *Calig.* 19; 35; *Jul.* 76; *Nero* 10; *Tib.* 26; Tac. *Ann.* 2, 83.

⁴¹ Ov. *Trist.* 3, 1, 35; 3, 1, 78.

regent of the god.⁴² Before his death, Caesar dreamt that he was soaring above the clouds and clasped hands with Jupiter.⁴³ Suetonius records, also, that Octavius, father of Augustus, in a dream saw his son *cum fulmine et sceptro exuviisque Iovis*.⁴⁴ The same author gives other dreams, too, connecting Augustus with Jupiter.⁴⁵ In coins commemorating the *consecratio* of emperors an eagle is often represented bearing the soul aloft.⁴⁶ Domitian was often called Jupiter,⁴⁷ while Caligula appropriately assumed the title of *Jupiter Latiaris*.⁴⁸ Augustus and Tiberius were represented on cameos as Jupiter,⁴⁹ and similar portraits of other emperors are to be seen.⁵⁰

One other very important consideration is that not only the *flamen Dialis*, the acknowledged priest of Jupiter, but also the *rex sacrorum*, together with consuls and generals, and later on, emperors, possessed insignia which had belonged to the ancient king. These things pertained to the gods also, especially to Jupiter. Among these were the *trabea*, the curule chair and the *fasces*. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus 4, 74, is the express statement that consuls were allowed to keep the regalia of kings, especially for festal days. On the day of his inauguration, the consul rode to the Capitol in a chariot, drawn by white horses, the insignia of Jove. Furthermore, the horses were sacrificed to Jupiter.⁵¹ The horses and chariot, also, as well as a gilded sceptre, crown and eagle added glory to generals in their triumphs.⁵² The *toga picta* which the triumphant general wore was preëminently the property of the Capitoline Jove. It may even have been kept in the temple, for Lampridius states that Alexander Severus never wore it, except as consul, and then it was the same one that other consuls wore, *de Iovis templo*

⁴² Hor. *Od.* 1, 12, 49-60.

⁴³ Suet. *Jul.* 81.

⁴⁴ Suet. *Aug.* 94.

⁴⁵ Suet. *Aug.* 94.

⁴⁶ Isid. 18, 2, 5; Platner *Top. Rom.*, p. 379; Stevenson *Dict. of Coins*, s. v. *consecratio*; cf. Suet. *Aug.* 97.

⁴⁷ Mart. 4, 1; 4, 3; 4, 8, 12; 6, 10; 9, 86; Stat. *Silv.* 1, 6, 25-26. Cf. Suet. *Dom.* 4; 13.

⁴⁸ Suet. *Calig.* 28.

⁴⁹ Baum. *Denk.* 3, pp. 1708-1710.

⁵⁰ Overbeck *Kunstmyth. Zeus* pp. 203 sqq.; Furtwängler *Ant. Gemmen* pl. 65, 48.

⁵¹ *J.* pp. 13 sqq.

⁵² Appian. 8, 66; Dio Cass. 44, 4-7; Dion. of Hal. 4, 74; Paulus-Fest. 209; Joseph. *Bell. Iud.* 7, 5, 3-6; Minuc. Felix. 22, 6; Liv. 1, 1, 8, 2-3; Plut. *Camill.* 7, 1; Q. R.

sumptam.⁵³ Livy expressly states that generals, when celebrating a triumph, were decorated with the insignia of Jupiter Optimus Maximus.⁵⁴ Lydus, moreover, specifies Caesar and Augustus as riding into the city as gods.⁵⁵ Isidorus gives another striking feature of the triumph: that the generals smeared their faces with a red color, *quasi imitarentur divini ignis effigiem*.⁵⁶ Now Pliny gives the information that the face of the statue of Jupiter and also the bodies of those who were triumphing were painted red.⁵⁷ It seems clear, then, that the generals were imitating not "divine fire," but the gods themselves. The crown which was offered to Caesar, he sent to the Capitoline Jove, with the statement that he alone was king,⁵⁸ thereby showing that he considered one who wore a crown as assuming the rôle of Jupiter. But, even though he could not take the title *rex*, Caesar nevertheless could, and did, receive divine honors. He had a priest, statues, a chariot, etc., all of which were emblems of godhead.⁵⁹ Politically, the Romans would not acknowledge a king, but they had no objections apparently, to considering their rulers gods.

From the foregoing examples it has been shown that early kings had the attributes of Jupiter, that later, consuls, generals, priests, and emperors had the same insignia. If, then, the *rex sacrorum*, the *flamen Dialis*, consuls, generals, and emperors severally performed duties all of which once belonged to an actual king, their regalia and privileges must have pertained to the individual whose powers they had assumed and divided among themselves. If these emblems were once the distinguishing marks of a deity, then the king, who had formerly borne them all, must have been the mortal representation of the god whose attributes he had.

113; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 612; 12, 206; Suet. *Nero.* 4, 25; Tacit. *Ann.* 4, 26; Verg. *Aen.* 7, 612; 12, 206; Zonaras 7, 21; cf. *J. Chapt. VIII*, note 12; for a discussion of triumphs and references see Frazer *Golden Bough, Magic Art*, pt. 2, pp. 174 sq.

⁵³ Lamprid. *Alex. Sever.* 40.

⁵⁴ Liv. 5, 23; 10, 7; see also Jul. Cap. *Gord.* 4, 4; Juv. 10, 38; Mayor on Juv. 10, 36; 10, 38.

⁵⁵ Lyd. *Magist. Reip. Rom.* 2, 2; 2, 3; cf. Mart. 7, 8, 2.

⁵⁶ Isid. 18, 2, 6; Serv. *Ecl.* 10, 27, states the same fact.

⁵⁷ Plin. *N. H.* 33, 7, 36, 111.

⁵⁸ Dio Cass. 44, 11; Suet. *Jul.* 79.

⁵⁹ Suet. *Jul.* 76; *J.* p. 47.

If, then, the ancient king had been the representative of Jupiter on earth, of course the *rex sacrorum*, the survival of the actual king, must have been a priest of Jupiter, not of Janus, as has been generally supposed.

But if this be true, Jupiter had two priests. And, indeed, the facts that are known, as well as the traditions that have been handed down, about the establishment of the body of priests at Rome, would lead to the belief that this was the fact. The Romans thought that Numa instituted the three great *flamines* and the *pontifex maximus*.⁶⁰ It is worth noting that it is said that he reserved for himself certain important duties, "especially those that pertain to the *flamen Dialis*."⁶¹ That is to say, the rites which in later times were performed by the priest of Jupiter, were the very ones that Numa did not resign, a circumstance that forms another link connecting the king to Jupiter. But, as Livy goes on to say, Numa nevertheless appointed a priest to Jupiter, because he felt that many of his royal successors, being more interested in war than in religion, would neglect the priesthood; while the appointment of a regular priest would make the continuance of the rites certain. The *flamen Dialis*, then, stood in the same relation to Jupiter that the *flamen Martialis* did to Mars, and the *flamen Quirinalis* to Quirinus, except for the fact that the deities whom the *flamines* of Mars and of Quirinus served were more or less distant divinities, whereas the god of the *flamen Dialis* was partly conceived of as an ethereal being, partly as incarnated in the earthly king.

The religious organization, then, during the regal period, after Numa had established his priesthods, may be classified as follows: the king, who discharged those duties which especially concerned royalty; a *pontifex maximus*, who was the head of the hierarchy;⁶² and three great *flamines*, who looked after the rites pertaining to their respective deities (consideration of the lesser *flamines* is not necessary to the present discussion). The appointment of the *pontifex maximus* and his subordinates was the beginning of the separation of religion and state. But, from the very nature of the royal office, this divorce could

⁶⁰ Cic. *Rep.* 2, 14, 26; Florus *Epit.* 1, 2; Lactant. *Instit.* 1, 22, 4; Liv. 1, 20; 4, 4, 1; Plut. *Numa* 7; 9; Varro *L. L.* 7, 45; Aur. Vict. *Vir. Ill.* 3.

⁶¹ Liv. 1, 20.

⁶² Paulus-Fest. 126.

not be complete. Therefore Numa, whose name doubtless stands for a long line of rulers who established these customs gradually, is said to have reserved for himself some important ceremonies. These would be such as were inseparable from, or preliminary to, some secular affairs which he could not afford to let slip from his hands; or they would be those which, because of their nature, required a king for their performance. Now, when the king expected to be away, at war, for instance, or was for any reason unwilling to burden himself with even the duties which he had reserved for his own supervision, he could, without in any way losing his control over these rites, appoint a substitute to perform them in his stead. That this was customary is shown by the *Acta Arvalium*, where there is given an instance of a person officiating at the regular sacrifice in the place of the usual priest.⁶³ From an old formula of Cato's it is clear that such substitutes often performed rites even for private individuals.⁶⁴ It is certain that a war-loving king would often avail himself of this privilege. And, indeed, in Livy 1, 33, an actual instance is given, *Ancus demandata cura sacrorum flaminibus sacerdotibusque aliis exercitu novo conscripto profectus, Politorium, urbem Latinorum vi cepit*. The proxy of a king would be temporarily a priest-king, a *rex sacrorum*.

Since the *pontifex maximus* was the head of the state religion, he was naturally the one to remind the king when the time came for the performing of the royal ceremonies; and, in case the king did not wish to officiate, he might also suggest a suitable proxy, or appoint one himself. Consequently, when the Republic was set up, the *pontifex maximus* may have been a man of considerable power, which was lodged in his own person, whereas the *rex sacrorum* was only the shadow of a king, a mere proxy. The fact that the office of *pontifex maximus* was so desirable as to be the object of keen contests, and to be held, in imperial times, by the emperor himself, whereas that of *rex* was never an object of contention,⁶⁵ reinforces this supposition. Although conjectural, this is more reasonable than the theory, based on the traditions of the Romans themselves, that, at the establishment of the Republic, the people from fear and hatred of the name of king, gave most of the religious duties to a *pontifex maximus* created for that purpose. Feel-

⁶³ *CIL*. VI, 2066, lines 2-3.

⁶⁴ Cato *R. R.* 139.

⁶⁵ Liv. 25, 5, 2; 27, 8, 4-5; 8-9; Dio Cas. 54, 27; Dion. of Hal. 4, 74; 5, 1.

ing, however, that they ought to have a religious king, they created the *rex sacrorum*, but they made his power very small, in order to discourage any attempt on his part to gain a real kingship. If this had been the motive of these early republicans, they might just as easily have abolished the kingship entirely and given all the religious duties of the ruler to the *pontifex maximus* or to some other. It is more reasonable to think that the title of *rex sacrorum* did not inspire fear or hatred, because the people had long been familiar with it as belonging to a person who could do no harm; that the offices of *pontifex maximus* and of *rex sacrorum* were not established at the expulsion of the kings; but that they were the result of a slow growth; that, at the establishment of the Republic the Romans found the religious and secular power of the state already lodged, to a certain extent, in different persons; and that, in accordance with their well-known conservatism, especially in religious matters, they left the religious hierarchy as it was, and simply gave the secular power of the king to the two consuls. Even this last step was no very violent revolution, since they were entirely familiar with the idea of election of kings.⁶⁶

These conjectures lend reasonableness to the contradictory state of affairs found in the existence of:

1. A *pontifex maximus*, who is the head of the religious organization of the state, and who is, however, not in any way the successor of the ancient king;

2. A *rex sacrorum*, who nominally ranks first of all the priests, who seems to be the survival of the primitive king, and yet is subordinate to the *pontifex maximus*, and appointed by him;

3. Vestal virgins, who are the survival of the king's daughters, but are nevertheless officially the daughters of the *pontifex maximus*, not of the *rex sacrorum*;

4. Royal titles, insignia, etc., which are borne by the gods, the *rex sacrorum*, the *pontifex maximus*, priests of Jupiter, consuls and generals, and emperors.

So far evidence has been produced showing that the *rex sacrorum* was a priest of Jupiter; it remains to bring forward the negative evidence by showing that he did not belong to Janus. This priest has been assigned to Janus because such an arrangement fits in so well with the

⁶⁶ Cic. *Rep.* 2, 17, 31; 2, 20, 35; 2, 21, 37; Liv. 1, 18; cf. Sall. *Bell. Cat.* 6, 6-7.

evident parallelism between household and state worship,⁶⁷ and because it has been thought to be corroborated by two passages, one in Ovid, and one in the *Acta Arvalium*. In *Fasti* I, 318, Ovid says of the *agonalia* of January 9:

Ianus agonali luce piandus erit.

In the following lines he adds that the *rex sacrorum* sacrificed a ram on that day. In the *Acta Arvalium*⁶⁸ a ram is mentioned as the offering to Janus. From these two passages it has been assumed⁶⁹ that the *rex* was a priest of Janus, and that he offered a ram to Janus on the first *Agonalia* of the year. Laurentius Lydus, an authority usually overlooked in this connection, and with reason, since he was a late Greek writer showing little knowledge of Roman affairs, says that this *agonalia* was a festival of the air. He then goes on to say that Janus is the air.⁷⁰ Evidently he, at least, thought that the day was sacred to Janus, probably basing his belief on the fact that it fell in the month of January. Besides, by the sixth century, when Lydus lived, the mythology of the Greeks and Romans had become so impregnated with Oriental mysticism that its original character was obscured; and Janus, accordingly, had become a cosmic deity, identified with Jupiter.⁷¹ Moreover, Lydus adds no further information about the nature of the ceremonies, but, by an excursus into Callimachus, attempts to explain the etymology of the word *Ianus*. His philosophizing, therefore, is worth nothing as evidence of the identity of the god of this *agonalia*. In Ovid's time, on the contrary, the rite was still being performed; and, under the encouragement of Augustus, every effort was being made to preserve the ancient ritual in its purity. What Ovid says about the ceremony is consequently worthy of some degree of respect. After making many conjectures about the etymology and meaning of the word *agonium*,

⁶⁷ Chapter VI, and the beginning of Chapter VII.

⁶⁸ *CIL*. VI, 2099, p. 559, line 24, and p. 561, line 9; 2104, p. 569, line 2; 2107, p. 575, line 8.

⁶⁹ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* p. 282 (Fowler, however, admits the doubt, cf. p. 288); Mommsen *CIL*. I, p. 375; p. 383, Jan. 9; Pauly *Real-Encycl.* vol. I, s.v. *agonium*; Wissowa *de Feriis Anni Rom.* p. XII; *Relig. u. Kult.* pp. 21; 103; Bailey *Relig. of Anc. Rome*, 77.

⁷⁰ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 2.

⁷¹ Cf. with Lydus, Proclus *Hymn to Hecate and Janus*.

and in these guesses he displays the same sort of pedantic ignorance as the other etymologists, Ovid says:

. Ita rex placare sacrorum
numina lanigerae coniuge debet ovis.⁷²

Varro, also, states that the rex sacrificed a ram on the agonalia, but does not name the divinity honored.⁷³ The word *numina* in the passage from Ovid may mean that more than one god was invoked. It may, however, be no more than an instance of the common use of the plural for the singular. This one word, therefore, cannot be taken as proof that Janus was not the god of the ceremony. But it is well known that Janus held the first place in the list of gods, and was regularly invoked in prayer before the other gods. When a complete list was given, Vesta held the last place.⁷⁴ This was so common that "Janus and Vesta" came to be a collective name for the body of deities to whom prayer was usually offered; as, for example, Juvenal says:

et farre et vino Ianum Vestamque rogabat.⁷⁵

Even when the sacrifice was not to be made to the whole company of great gods, including Janus, but to some one divinity, a preliminary offering was generally given to Janus, as is attested by many formulas,⁷⁶ and by these lines of Ovid:

. Cur quamvis aliorum numina placem,
Iane, tibi primum tura merumque fero?⁷⁷

Macrobius, also, states the same fact: invocarique primum, cum alicui deo res divina celebratur.⁷⁸ In view of this fact, it seems most probable that the *Ianus piandus* simply means, "a sacrifice must be made."

⁷² Ov. *F.* 1, 333-334.

⁷³ Varro *L. L.* 6, 12.

⁷⁴ *J.* Chapt. II.

⁷⁵ Juv. 6, 386.

⁷⁶ *J.* Chapt. II.

⁷⁷ Ov. *F.* 1, 171-172. In Ov. *F.* 3, 881-882, almost the same expression is used:

Ianus adorandus cumque hoc Concordia mitis
et Romana Salus ara que Pacis erit.

Peter takes this festival to include Janus. There is nothing, however, in the references to the Altar of Peace on which to base the supposition that Janus had anything to do with it. The Calendars do not mention him with the dedication of the altar, *CIL.* I, pp. 313; 385, Jan. 29 and 30; Dio Cass. 54, 25; *Mon. Ancy.* 12, 37-41; Platner, pp. 361-362; cf. *J.* p. 9.)

⁷⁸ Macrob 1, 9, 9.

To be sure, Ovid does not disclose the identity of the deity to whom a sacrifice is made on this *agonalia*. It is possible, therefore, either that the ancient god had been forgotten, while his festival survived, as was the case in the *Lupercalia*, or that the offering was made to the great gods collectively. At any rate, there is no reason for thinking that Janus was the god honored, or that the *rex sacrorum* was his priest. Since the *rex* was a priest of Jupiter, there is a bare possibility that this sacrifice at which he officiated was held in honor of that god. If this had been the case, however, it seems probable that Ovid would have mentioned the fact, as he does when describing the ceremonies of the Ides.⁷⁹ Since no particular deity is mentioned for January 9, it seems more likely that the day was celebrated in honor of the great divinities of the state. And the *rex* because of his position of priest of Jupiter, would not have been debarred from performing a sacrifice to the other gods of the community. The ancient king, being head of the state religion, would certainly worship all the deities of the commonwealth. The *rex sacrorum*, his successor, would do the same.

The calendars give no mark except *AGON* for January 9,⁸⁰ but, beside the three other days thus marked, there are noted some festivals: on March 17, the festival in honor of Liber,⁸¹ on May 21, that in honor of Veiovis,⁸² and on December 11, the *Septimontium*.⁸³ Whether or not the other festivals marked in the calendars as falling on the days of the *agonalia* had any connection with the word *agonium* or with each other, is not clear. From the connection of the priest of Jupiter with the first one, it might be assumed that all the days referred to the same god, and perhaps celebrated different phases of his activity. The whole matter is, however, extremely doubtful.⁸⁴

All the evidence so far cited has gone to prove that the *rex sacrorum* was a priest of Jupiter, not of Janus. There exists the difficulty that, if this servitor is taken away from Janus, the great god of entrances is left entirely bereft of priest or *flamen*. Modern authors seem to have

⁷⁹ Ov. *F.* 1, 587 sqq.

⁸⁰ *CIL.* I, p. 383, Jan. 9.

⁸¹ *CIL.* I, p. 388; Varro *L. L.* 6, 14.

⁸² *CIL.*, I, p. 394.

⁸³ *CIL.* I, p. 407; Paulus-Fest. 340.

⁸⁴ Fowler *Rom. Fest.* p. 281. Other references to the *agonium*: Paulus-Fest. 10; Lyd. *Mens.* 3, 25; Ov. *F.* 5, 721-722 (this is simply a cross-reference to the first book,

assigned the *rex sacrorum* to Janus partly from a desire to see the important office filled. However, Janus is not the only deity of recognized dignity who is thus destitute. There are several gods who lack *flamines*, among them Consus, a divinity of some rank in the state ritual.⁸⁵

There remain to be discussed the few facts that are known about the *rex sacrorum*, and to show that they are not inconsistent with the theory that he was an incarnate priest of Jupiter. He was the first in the *ordo sacerdotum*. Consequently, at the banquets of the priests, he sat at the head of the table. This was not because he was a priest of Janus, who came first in the list of gods, but because he was originally the head of the whole state religion. Next to him came the *flamen Dialis*.⁸⁶ This sequence, again, was due not to the superiority of Janus over Jupiter, but to the predominance of the incarnate Jupiter-king over his own *priest*.

The *rex sacrorum* held office for life.⁸⁷ This may have been because the ancient king had reigned as long as he lived. His person was inviolable.⁸⁸ His wife was called the *regina sacrorum*.⁸⁹ He could hold no other office.⁹⁰ This was not due to fear that he might increase his power, but to the very nature of his priesthood. For, as has been said, the early kings found the taboos and religious duties of their office too burdensome. They appointed therefore "kings of sacred things" to assist in bearing the burden of royalty. Certainly, then, the office would not be given to a man who had duties of his own. Plutarch gives the interesting information that the *rex* was not allowed to make a speech in any public place.⁹¹ This seems to emphasize his position as a mere proxy, who could do nothing on his own initiative.

On the first day of the month the *rex sacrificulus*, as the *rex sacrorum* is sometimes called, summoned the people to the Curia Calabra, on the

where the question is treated more fully; it does not mean that the festival is concerned with Janus. *Janum* simply means January); Varro *L. L.* 6, 12 sq.

⁸⁵ Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* pp. 20-21.

⁸⁶ Fest. 185; Gell. 10, 15, 21.

⁸⁷ Dion. of Hal. 4, 74.

⁸⁸ Serv. *Aen.* 8, 646.

⁸⁹ *CIL.* VI, 2123; 2124; Macrob. 1, 15, 19.

⁹⁰ Dion. of Hal. 4, 74; 5, 1; Plut. *Q. R.* 63.

⁹¹ *Plut. Q. R.* 63.

Capitoline, and, after performing a sacrifice, announced to them on which day the *Nones* of that month would fall. Meantime his wife, the *regina sacrorum*, sacrificed in the Regia. On the *Nones*, the *rex* again assembled the people and gave them information about the festivals for the month.⁹² This assembling of the people was a duty which the early king would naturally not relegate to another, although he gave up most of the purely religious rites to different priests. But, since the right to hold an assembly was bound up with his secular power, he would realize that to part with it was unsafe. But for the king's proxy to hold the assembly would be perfectly safe, for that was exactly the same as if the king had done it in person. Then, as the assembly gradually lost its political importance, it would be most natural for the king to leave it more and more in the hands of the proxy, especially when the occasion was a religious one, recurring with irksome frequency. This may explain why the *rex sacrorum* convened the popular assembly. At the establishment of the Republic, since this convoking of the people had come to be looked upon as one of his regular duties, it remained under his jurisdiction. These interpretations of the various duties of the *rex sacrorum* are, of course, merely conjectural; but they seem reasonable. The growing unimportance of the old assembly, over which the king presided, can be seen from the fact that in historical times, it was called but twice a year, to legalize wills and adoptions. The days on which it convened are marked on the calendars *Q. R. C. F.* In a note in Paulus-Festus, there seems to be a confusion between these days and that of the Regifugium.⁹³ The note in the Praenestine Calendar, however, seems to be correct, in which it is stated that the days were so marked because after the assembly had been held, business might be resumed,⁹⁴ and Varro states that *Q. R. C. F.* means *quando rex comitiavit; fas*.⁹⁵

There is a reference in Paulus-Festus to *regiae feriae*. This festival may have been performed by the king in early times and by the *rex sacrorum* in later times, if the name can be taken to mean anything. Unfortunately the ceremony is not referred to anywhere, at least by

⁹² Macrob. 1, 15, 9-12; 1, 15, 19; Serv. *Aen.* 8, 654; Varro *L. L.* 6, 27-28.

⁹³ Fest. 258; 278.

⁹⁴ *CIL.* I, p. 315.

⁹⁵ Varro *L. L.* 6, 31; see also *CIL.* I, pp. 301; 315; 367 and Mommsen's note; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 63 sqq.

this name, except in the very imperfect passage in Festus; Regiae Feriae dictae videntur, quae fiunt fori, comitiique lustrandi causa fulguris fit ubi quo regiae feriae.⁹⁶ These words seem to refer to some kind of piacular offering for lightning; if so, the fact that the rex presided is another link connecting him and Jupiter, the thunderer.

As has been mentioned before, the Regia was the survival of the residence of the early kings.⁹⁷ Therefore it would be natural to suppose that the *rex sacrorum* lived in it. But it is not certain whether it was the residence of the *rex* or of the *pontifex* or of both.⁹⁸ If it was the home of one of these exclusively, the other may have had an office in it. At any rate, the *rex sacrorum* and his wife performed sacrifices there.⁹⁹ Possibly the custom changed at different times, and possibly too, when the Forum ceased to be a desirable place in which to live, both these dignitaries moved to a more pleasant neighborhood, merely keeping offices in the Regia.

None of the data here given about the duties and privileges of the *rex sacrorum* are inconsistent with the theory that he was a priest of Jupiter. Moreover, there is very little to connect this shadow of royalty with the simplicity of Janus, who had very little to do with kings.

⁹⁶ Fest. 278.

⁹⁷ *J.* p. 45.

⁹⁸ Dio Cass. 54, 27; Paulus-Fest. 279; 290 (these passages appear to contradict each other); Serv. *Aen.* 8, 363; Fowler *Rom. Fest.* pp. 282; 335; Huelsen *Rom. For.*, Carter's trans. pp. 180 sqq.; Platner pp. 210 sqq.; Richter *Topogr. der Stadt Rom*, pp. 91-92.

⁹⁹ Paulus-Fest. 278.

CHAPTER VIII

RELATION OF JANUS TO OTHER DEITIES

Jupiter

Much of the difficulty about the overlapping functions of deities arises from a misconception of the origin and character of divinity. No deity was patron of only one thing; as, for instance, Apollo was not god of the sun and of nothing else, nor Diana of the moon only. Deities may have originated as specialists, but they could not long remain so. If, for instance, one man prayed to his spear for protection, another might supplicate his door, and immediately there would ensue a confusion of the functions of the two *numina*. So Mars, the field god, became a war god. So did Jupiter, the sky god.

But the confusion between Jupiter and Janus is greatest of all, for both seem to be supreme. It is these irreconcilable claims that led to the theory that the two were identical.¹ Not only modern scholars, but the ancients, also, were disturbed by this similarity in the characteristics of Jupiter and Janus. St. Augustine asks: Cum ergo et Ianus mundus sit, et Iupiter mundus sit, unusque sit mundus, quare duo dii sint, Ianus et Iupiter?² He quotes Varro for a kind of explanation: quoniam penes Ianum sunt prima, penes Iovem summa. But, as is shown throughout this paper, Janus did not originally occupy so lofty a position as that assigned him by Augustine; he was a lowly doorkeeper. Neither was Jupiter so noble a conception; he was an earthly king. It was only after a long period, when the Romans had become acquainted with the philosophic ideas of the Greeks, that they gave to their gods the sublime character of world deities.

The following inscription has been taken as evidence that Janus and Jupiter were identical:

I O V I
D I A N O
C . H E R R E

¹ Cook *Class. Rev.* 18, p. 368; Frazer *Lect. on Kingship*, pp. 285 sqq.; *Golden Bough, Magic Art*, pt. 2, pp. 381 sqq.; Linde *de Iano summo Rom. deo*.

² Aug. *C. D.* 7, 10; cf. 4, 11; 7, 9; 7, 11.

N . N I V S (Sic)
C A N D I D V S
V . S . L . M .³

This has been supposed (thus Orelli-Henzen no. 5622) to be dedicated to a single deity, Jupiter Janus. It may just as well be taken to mean, "to Jupiter and to Janus." Many other inscriptions can be found in which the names of divinities are combined without punctuation or conjunction. One such is the following:

I O V I O P T I M O
M A X I M O I U N O
N I R E G I N A E M I N
E R V A E S A N C T A E
S O L I M I T H R A E etc.⁴

The first inscription is, moreover, very poorly cut, as can be seen from the copy. Surely it is useless as evidence about the name of the god, when even the name of the man who set it up is incorrectly written.

But St. Augustine unconsciously adds to the passage quoted above, the test by which it can be determined whether or not the two divinities were the same: *seorsus habent templa, seorsus aras, diversa sacra*. If two divinities differ in place of worship, in cult, in origin and in name, a few similar functions, or qualities, will not make them identical.

Even in the literary period of Rome's history, there was little in common between Jupiter Optimus Maximus, with his triumphal robes and crowns and pomp of sacrifice, and Janus, whose name came at the beginning of every prayer, to be sure, but for whose worship a few cakes, or, at most, a ram sufficed. Both were elevated by the concepts of philosophers into world deities. But it is to be noted that other deities, also, share in this elevating process. To quote St. Augustine again: *Ipse in aethere sit Iupiter, ipse in aere Iuno, ipse in mari Neptunus, in Iano initiator etc.*⁵ Having begun, then, in entirely different strata of religious conceptions, Janus and Jupiter arrived, finally at the same goal.

³ *CIL.* 5, 783.

⁴ *CIL.* 8, 4578.

⁵ *S. Aug. C. D.* 4, 11.

Saturn

Saturn was an ancient god of agriculture. It is natural, therefore, that he should have some characteristics in common with the weather god, Jupiter. One strange rite resembling some of the ceremonies of Jupiter is recorded by Professor Frazer.⁶ The Roman soldiers on the Danube in their celebration of the Saturnalia, slew a youth who was dressed to impersonate the god Saturn. Arguing from the resemblance of this ceremony to the cult of the human Jupiter, Professor Frazer comes to the conclusion that Jupiter, Janus and Saturn were different forms of the same deity. It is possible, as Professor Frazer says, that the worship of a human Jupiter may have been brought in by a conquering people and may have supplanted that of a human Saturn. In this way the two gods may have become blended. But, if the reiterated rule that difference in cult marks difference in deity is to be upheld, then the two are distinct divinities.

Mention has been made of the myths concerning Janus and Saturn.⁷ In these stories Janus comes to Italy, bringing new ideas of civilization, or, he hospitably receives Saturn, from whom he obtains knowledge of the new arts of life. He is called the son of Hecate and of the sky,⁸ and is sometimes given a sister Camise, a son Aether, and a daughter Olisthene.⁹ He is the founder of the Janiculum, as Saturn is of Saturnia.¹⁰ These stories all seem to be concerned with the very early importation of merchandise and of certain new ideas of civilization. These the Romans seem to have received from the Greeks, along with an anthropomorphic form of Hermes, whom they identified with their Janus.

Juno

The title Junonius would seem to indicate some connection between Janus and Juno. Macrobius argues from it that the Kalends were

⁶ Frazer *Lectures on the Early Hist. of the Kingship*, Chapt. 9. (In Herodian 1, 16, is the statement that the Saturnalia was celebrated in honor of Janus, which might be taken as additional evidence for Professor Frazer's theory. This is clearly, however, a confusion on the part of the historian, for he goes on to say, as a reason for the celebration, that Janus received Saturn during his exile.)

⁷ *J.* Chap. V.

⁸ Arnob. 3, 29.

⁹ Athen. 15, 46.

¹⁰ Arnob. 1, 36; 3, 29; Isid. 15, 1, 50; Macrobi. 1, 7, 23; Serv. *Aen.* 8, 357.

sacred to Janus as well as to Juno.¹¹ That this is erroneous has been shown.¹² Servius thought that, because Juno had at one time opened the gates of *Janus Geminus*, Janus received a name from her.¹³ But the story told in Vergil is, of course, not the origin of the epithet.¹⁴ The meaning of the title seemingly derived from the name of Juno is, however, obscure. In one case only, do the two deities seem to be connected in cult. This is at the Tigillum Sororum. This Tigillum was a beam across a street, or alley, which led from the *Carinae* to the *Cyprium Angiportum*. It was supported by the walls of the houses on each side of the street.¹⁵ The story told of it is that during the war with the Albans, there was a battle between the Horatii and the Curiatii. One of the Horatii killed one of the Curiatii, to whom his sister was betrothed. Returning home with the spoils, he met his sister and attempted to kiss her. But she, recognizing the cloak of her lover, warded off the kiss, and turned aside and wept. Her brother then in his anger killed her. Being condemned to death, he appealed to the people and was acquitted. To expiate his crime, however, he, or his father for him, erected a yoke, under which the youth was made to pass. Beneath the yoke were put two altars, one to *Janus Curiatius*, the other to *Juno Sororia*.¹⁶ For this reason, the beam was called *Tigillum Sororum*. The beam was held in veneration for a long period. Sacrifices were performed at it annually.¹⁷ It is recorded that the Arval Brothers made an offering there even as late as the fourth century A. D.¹⁸ But the real meaning of the Tigillum and of the story connected with it, is not at all certain. Roscher suggested that it was a relic of a very old spell of creeping under wood to get rid of witchcraft.¹⁹ Dr. L. D. Barnett's theory that it was a fetish carries out this idea a little farther.²⁰ The conjunction of an altar to Juno and one to Janus seems

¹¹ Macrob. 1, 9, 16.

¹² *J.* p. 17 sqq.

¹³ Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610; *J.* pp. 17-18.

¹⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 7, 620-621.

¹⁵ Dion. of Hal. 3, 22; Cook, *Class. Rev.* 18, p. 369; Platner pp. 258; 450.

¹⁶ S. Aug. *C. D.* 3, 14; Dion. of Hal. 3, 15, 22; Paulus-Fest. 297; 307; Liv. 1, 24-26; cf. Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1; Platner Top. Rom. pp. 258; 450.

¹⁷ Dion. of Hal. 3, 15, 22.

¹⁸ *CIL.* I, p. 402, Oct. 1.

¹⁹ Roscher *Lex. s.v.*

²⁰ *Class. Rev.* 12, p. 463.

to show a connection between the two deities. But their relationship here is not clear. However, whatever other association there was between them, it is at least certain that both were concerned with childbirth, for Juno was the protectress of women at childbirth, and Janus was the man's special deity, a god of generation. It is possible that the epithet *Junonius* refers to this function. The Janus of men, however, does not correspond to the Juno of women, for the *numen* of a man was a spirit with a definite name, his *Genius*; woman's *numen* was Juno, who, however, was not limited to the one function as was the *numen Genius*.

Diana

The name of Diana still more closely resembles that of Janus. Another form *Iana* occurs;²² and, conversely, of Janus there exists a form *Dianus*.²³ Whatever etymology is accepted for these words it makes no difference in determining the character of the deities. If the form *Ianus* is the original one, and if this is derived from an extension of the root of *eo*, "to go",²⁴ it is, of course appropriate to the door-god, and also to the birth-goddess, who is always associated with the phases of the wandering moon. On the other hand, a derivation from the root *diu*, considered as the foundation of the form *Dianus*,²⁵ will suit the character of the deity equally well. Almost any god can be considered "shining" or "godlike." The adjective is especially suited to Janus, since he was the opening at the door-way, through which came all the light into the primitive Italic house. If the theory is accepted that the same root appears in Janus, Jupiter, Juno, Dione, etc., it follows, not that these deities were identical²⁶ but that the same general quality was assumed in all of them. To attempt a solution of this vexed problem in etymology, however, is not the purpose of this paper, especially since, as has been shown, none of the derivations advanced by different scholars interferes with the theory herein presented. This Diana, whose name seems to be the feminine form of Janus, was, according to

²¹ Cf. Carter, *Religious Life of Ancient Rome*, p. 11.

²² Varro *R. R.* 1, 37, 3; Macrob. 1, 9, 8.

²³ *CIL.* V, 783.

²⁴ Cic. *N. D.* 2, 27, 67; Macrob. 1, 9, 11; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 610; Walde *s.v.*

²⁵ *CIL.* V, 783.

²⁶ Frazer *Lect. on the Early History of the Kingship*, pp. 285 sqq.

Professor Carter,²⁷ the Diana of Aricia who had been a close neighbor of that incarnate king, the *Rex Nemorensis*.²⁸ Many votive offerings found at her sanctuary prove that she was a goddess of birth, as well as of the woods. Professor Carter thinks, also, that she came to Rome when Aricia became head of the Latin League, and that her temple on the Aventine was of importance, not to the Roman people, but only to the League, since her office at Rome was already filled by *Juno Lucina*. Perhaps some of Diana's later popularity was due to an identification with the Greek Artemis. At any rate, she was certainly an important goddess of birth, and side by side with her, Juno retained her position unimpaired. This is still another example of the overlapping of the functions²⁹ of deities.

Mater Matuta

Once in literature Ianus is called *Matutine Pater*, a title which might be interpreted as connecting him with *Mater Matuta*, and as making him the god of dawn.³⁰ But, as has been argued before, the adjective *matutinus* is used elsewhere with no more meaning than "in the morning"; and it is entirely in the spirit of the passage in which it occurs, to take the epithet to signify humorously, "early rising Janus," of, "father of early risers."³¹ If this be true, the title does not prove any religious connection between Janus and the dawn, or between him and *Mater Matuta*, beyond the fact that both had some association with birth. There is, to be sure, an inscription to *Janus Pater* and *Mater Matuta*.³² But this does not argue any great connection between them. Often divinities that have little association in cult are honored by inscriptions on the same stone.

Ops Consiva

Still another tie connecting Janus with the long list of birth-gods, is the fact that as *Janus Consivius*,³³ he has the same title as Ops, who

²⁷ Carter *Relig. of Numa*, pp. 53 sqq.

²⁸ *J.* Chapt. VII.

²⁹ Hor. *Carm. Saec.*

³⁰ Hor. *Sat.* 2, 6, 20-23; Bailey *Relig. of Anc. Rome*, p. 77; Wissowa, p. 109.

³¹ *J.*, pp. 20-21.

³² *CIL.* VIII, S. 11797; cf. Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.*, p. 110.

³³ Lyd. *Mens.* 4, 1; Macrob. 1, 9, 15; Tert. *Nat.* 2, 11.

is sometimes called Opeconsiva.³⁴ She seems to have been a goddess of fertility in general, both of the fields, and of the animal world.

Carna

There is a remarkable absence of myths concerning Janus. This is probably due to the fact that this deity had no Greek counterpart, whose exploits could be attributed to him. St. Augustine makes this scarcity of legend the subject of a very good pun: *An forte voluerunt ut, quoniam plurimi dii selecti erubescenda perpetrando amiserant frontem, quanto iste innocentior esset, tanto frontosior appareret?*³⁵

In spite of the grave authority of St. Augustine, however, it must be admitted that there were a few myths about the many-faced god. Ovid tells one of him and Carna, which may properly be classed as *erubescenda*.³⁶ In this narrative, the poet makes Carna a goddess of the door hinge, so that he seems to have confused Carna and Cardea. In spite of this mistake, it is possible that Ovid was right, however, in assuming some connection between Carna and Janus. If so, the association was not with the primary quality of door-god, but with the secondary one of birth-god. For Carna was a protecting deity of infants. The story of the two deities may have arisen through this relation. The tale could hardly have been well known, however, since St. Augustine, for all his deep researches into Paganism, says that Janus was free from myths of this sort.

³⁴ Varro *L. L.* 6, 21.

³⁵ S. Aug. *C. D.* 7, 4.

³⁶ Ov. *F.* 6, 101 sq.

CHAPTER IX

MISCELLANIES

Inscriptions

It is a curious fact that no dedicatory inscriptions to Janus have been found in Italy.¹ If any had existed, it is hard to believe that all could have been lost or destroyed. The inference is, therefore, that in Italy few, if any, stones were inscribed in his honor. A few have been found in the provinces. Two come from Numidia.² One of these is especially interesting, because of the false declension of the words: IANI PATRO.³ Of the others,⁴ some are dedicated to *Janus Pater*, some have the word *Janus* unqualified. The poorly cut inscription from Narbonensian Gaul, bearing the words IOVI DIANO, and the stone in honor of Janus and *Mater Matuta* have been mentioned in another Chapter.⁵

Spolia Opima

Besides the cult at the *Janus Geminus*, it is barely possible that another ceremony, that of the *spolia opima* connected Janus with war. In Paulus-Festus is the statement that the third sort of *spolia opima* was dedicated to *Janui Quirino*.⁶ This is, however, the only passage which mentions Janus as a recipient of these trophies. Plutarch gives the information that there were three kinds of *spolia opima*: of these, the first was offered to Jupiter, the second to Mars, the third, to Quirinus. Servius says that Romulus presented the first kind to Jupiter, Cossus, the second to Mars; and Marcellus, the third to Quirinus. But this Quirinus, he identifies with Mars.⁸ It is to be seen from this, that there is little foundation for assuming that Janus had a share in the *spolia*. In fact all the evidence about the *spolia opima* is so contradictory that no conclusion about it can be reached until more information is brought to light.

¹ Wissowa *Relig. u. Kult.* p. 106.

² *CIL.* VIII, 2608; 4576.

³ *CIL.* VIII, 2608.

⁴ *CIL.* III, 2881; 2969; 3030; 3158; 5092 a; VIII, S. 15577; 16417; 12, 1065.

⁵ *J.* pp. 68-69.

⁶ *Fest.* 189.

⁷ *Plut. Marcell.* 8.

⁸ *Serv. Aen.* 6, 859.

Circenses of January Seventh

An additional honor was paid to Janus by the emperors in naming the games held in the circus on January 7 for him. The Calendar of Philocalus contains the only reference to these games.⁹ It has been seen that the revival of religion under Augustus caused Janus, as well as some of the other old deities, to regain some of his former importance in state ritual.¹⁰ The fact that his name led the list of gods, and that the frequent intervals of peace made it possible to close the gates of his arch perhaps contributed to make him more prominent in the thought of the people than he had been for several generations. It was natural therefore, that when the emperors established new games to take place on January 7, they should have named them for Janus. Mommsen thinks that the games were thus named because they were the first of the year, and were consequently dedicated to the god of beginnings.¹¹ However, as in other instances, nothing is said in the Calendar about Janus in this capacity. It seems more probable, on the contrary, that the games were dedicated to Janus, because they came in his month.

⁹ *CIL.* I, p. 334; pp. 382-383.

¹⁰ *J.* pp. 27-28.

¹¹ Mommsen's note in *CIL.* I, pp. 382-383.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion the development of Janus may be summarized briefly as follows: Janus originated as a simple *numen* of the doorway. He developed into a god of generation, of war, and of commerce. He was not a god of beginnings; and had no place in the ceremonies of the Kalends or of New Year's Day. He had neither festival nor priest. Before the dawn of literature, at Rome, other deities had usurped most of the powers he had possessed. He was obscured by the showiness of the Greek and other foreign gods, more than all else by the worship of Jupiter, while the simplicity of his worship prevented it from being incorporated in the more elaborate state ceremonies. In spite of this, however, he held a place in religion to the end of Paganism, because he had, in the formative period of the ritual, gained the foremost position in all prayers and formulas, a position from which he could not be dislodged.

He retained one cult of his own. No war could be begun properly until the gates of his arch were thrown open. Under the emperors he enjoyed a slight revival. This resuscitation, however, was little more than literary: the only result in worship was that one of the celebrations in the circus was named for him. So little impression did this honor make, however, that no reference is made to it, outside the calendar of events.

Finally, because of his unique position in all rituals and because of the material prominence of his arch in the Forum, and partly, perhaps, on account of the mystery surrounding his origin and real character, he appealed strongly to the imagination of the poets and writers of classical and succeeding times. Through their writings he gained the position of god of beginnings, of the sky, and even of creator of the world. These concepts have had most influence on the opinions of modern scholars, but they do not belong to the true character of the god, Janus.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(References in the footnotes are so cited as to be clear in themselves, without the help of a key. This thesis is referred to as J.)

- Allen, Grant, *The Evolution of the Idea of God; an Inquiry into the Origins of Religion*. London, 1897.
- Appel, G. *De Romanorum Precationibus*, in *Religionsgesch. Versuche u. Vorarb.* VII, 2. Geissen, 1909.
- Aust, Emil, *Die Religion der Römer*. Münster, 1899.
- Axtell, Harold L. *The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions*. Chicago, 1907.
- Bailey, Cyril, *The Religion of Ancient Rome*. London, 1907.
- Barnett, L. D. Review of J. B. Carter's *De Deorum Romanorum Cognominibus Quaestiones Selectae*, in *Classical Review*, XII, 463 sq. London, 1898.
- Boethke, K. *Über das Wesen des Janus*. Thorn, 1863.
- Boissier, Gaston, *la Religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*. Paris, 1874.
- Bouché-Leclercq *Les pontifes de l'anc. Rome*. Paris, 1871.
- Bréal, Michel *Mélanges de Mythologie et de Linguistique*. Paris, 1877.
- Carter, J. B. *De Deorum Romanorum Cognominibus Quaestiones Selectae*. Leipzig, 1898.
Die Etrusker u. die römische Religion, in *Mitteilungen des kais. deut. archäolog. Instituts, Röm. Abteilung*. 1910.
The Religion of Numa. London, 1906.
The Religious Life of Ancient Rome. Boston, 1911.
- Cook, Arthur Bernard, *Zeus, Jupiter, and the Oak*, in *Classical Review* XVII, pp. 174 sqq., 268 sqq., 403 sqq.; 1903; XVIII, pp. 75 sqq., 325 sqq., 360 sqq., 1904. London.
- Cumont, Franz, *Un Livre nouveau sur la liturgie païenne*, in *Revue de l'Instruction Publique en Belgique* XLVII, 1, pp. 1-10. Brussels, 1904.
- Deecke, Wilhelm *Etruskische Forschungen u. Studien*.
- Deubner, L. *Personifikationen abstrakter Begriffe*, in W. H. Roscher's *Lexikon, d. griech. u. römisch. Mythologie*, pp. 2067 sqq. Leipzig, 1902-1909.
- Domaszewski, Alfred, *Dei Certi und Dei Incerti*, in *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* X, 1, pp. 1-10. Leipzig 1907.
- Fairley, William, *Monumentum Ancyranum*, in *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History, Published by the Department of History of the University of Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia, 1898.
- Fowler, W. Warde, *Jupiter and the Triumphator*, in *Classical Review* XXX, Nos. 5 & 6. London, 1916.
The Religious Experience of the Roman People. London, 1911.
The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic. London, 1899
- Frazer, James G. *The Golden Bough*. London, 1911.
Lectures on the Early History of the Kingship. London, 1905.
- Gross, Otto, *De Metonymiis Sermonis Latini a Deorum Nominibus Petitis*, in *Disserationes Philologicae Hallenses* XIX, pp. 297 sqq. Halle, 1911.

- Gruppe, O. *Bericht über die Litteratur zur antiken Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte aus den Jahren 1893-1897, in Jahresbericht über Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. 102.* Leipzig, 1900.
- Hartung, J. A. *Die Religion der Römer.* Erlangen, 1836.
- Hempel, Geo. *The Salian Hymn to Janus, in Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association XXXI, pp. 182 sqq.* 1900.
- Henzen, W. *Acta Fratrum Arvalium Quae Supersunt.* Berlin, 1874.
- Jevons, F. B. *The Idea of God in Early Religions.* Cambridge, 1910.
Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion. New York, 1912.
Comparative Religion; a Survey of its Recent Literature. Edinburgh, 1910.
- Jullian, Camille, *La relig. rom. deux. siècles avant notre ère, in Mélanges De Rossi, pp. 311-342.*
- Lang, Andrew, *The Making of Religion.* London, 1900.
The Origins of Religion. London, 1908.
- Linde, S. *De Iano Summo Romanorum Deo,* Lund, 1891.
- Maass, E. W. T. *Die Tagesgötter in Rom und den Provinzen.* Berlin, 1902.
- Marchi De, Attilio, *Il Culto Privato di Roma Antica.* Milan, 1896.
- Marquardt, Joachim, *Römische Staatsverwaltung.* Leipzig, 1878.
- Maurenbrecher, B. *Carminum Saliarium Reliquiae, in Philol. Jahrb. Suppl. XXI, pp. 315-353,* 1894.
- May, G. *Le Flamen Dialis et la Virgo Vestalis. Études de Droit Religieux, in Revue des Études Anciennes, I, pp. 3-16,* 1905.
- Mommsen, Th. *Römisches Staatsrecht.* Leipzig, 1877.
- Müller, Fried. Max, *Anthropological Religion.* London, 1892.
Einleitung in die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft². Strassburg, 1876.
Natural Religion. London, 1889.
Physical Religion. London, 1890.
- Nissen, Heinrich, *Das Templum.* Berlin, 1869.
Orientation, Studien zur Geschichte der Religion, 2 Heft, p. 28. 1906.
- Overbeck, J. A. *Griechische Kunstmythologie.* Leipzig, 1871-1889.
- Preller, L. *Römische Mythologie.* Berlin, 1858.
- Preller-Jordan, *Römische Mythologie³.* Berlin, 1881.
- Reinach, S. *Cultes, Mythes et Religions.* Paris, 1908.
- Roscher, W. H. *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen u. römischen Mythologie, Suppl. E. H. Berger Mythische Kosmographie der Griechen, Lex. 8.* Leipzig, 1904.
- Roscher, W. H. *Studien zur vergleichenden Mythologie der Griechen und Römer.* Leipzig, 1873-1875.
- Samter, Ernst, *Familienfeste der Griechen und Römer.* Berlin, 1901.
- Saussaye, De la, Chantepie P. D. *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte, in Sammlung Theolog. Lehrbücher.* Lübingen, 1905.

- Schulze, Wilhelm *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*. Berlin, 1904.
- Siecke, Ernst, *Götterattribute und sogenannte Symbole*. Jena, 1909.
- Speyer, J. S. *Le dieu romain Janus*, in *Revue de l'histoire des religions* XXVI, pp. 1 sqq. Paris, 1892.
- Usener, H. *Götternamen. Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*. Bonn, 1896.
- Strena Helbigiana*. Leipzig, 1900.
- Vorträge und Aufsätze*. Leipzig, 1907.
- Walde, Alois, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1910.
- Wissowa, Georg, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Staatsgeschichte*. München, 1904.
- Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie*. Stuttgart, 1894—
- Religion und Kultus der Römer*. Munich, 1912.
- Zielinski, Th. *Genius und Juno*, in *Philologus, Neue Folge* XVIII, 1, pp. 20-21.
- Rom und Seine Gottheit*, in *Beilage zur münchener allgemeinen Zeitung*, 1903, N. 37-39.
- Zimmermann, Aug. *Zur Etymologie des Namens Juno*, in *Wochenschrift für Klass. Philol.* XXII, 990 sqq.
- Zimmermann, Daniel, *Das Wesen des Janus*. Erlangen, 1852.

